

Mill Creek Academy School



Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-mce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Mill Creek we will inspire students to be lifelong learners with integrity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Learning Community of Mill Creek will ensure that ALL achieve their fullest potential through challenging, purposeful learning opportunities where life-long learning becomes a passion!

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Goodwin, Kenneth	Principal	<p>The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Ottosen, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Loughran, Jill	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Barnes, David	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Sclafani, Lisa	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Kelley, Crystal	Instructional Coach	<p>The ILC develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with the whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for students considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team. The ILC plans and provides ongoing, job-embedded professional development to support our instructional staff.</p>
Galbraith, Sherry	Instructional Coach	<p>The ILC develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with the whole school screening programs that provide</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		early intervention services for students considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team. The ILC plans and provides ongoing, job-embedded professional development to support our instructional staff.
Williams, Kourtney	Other	The testing coordinators organizes and facilitates all state-wide testing. In addition, the testing coordinator collects and analyzes state-wide and common formative assessment testing data. The testing coordinator works with the leadership team and collaborative teams (PLCs) to analyze the data and identify strategic intervention and acceleration strategies.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team reviews student data throughout the year and closely monitors student progress. The school leadership teamwork with grade-level and content area Professional Learning Communities to implement research-based, high-yield strategies to improve student achievement. Ongoing progress is shared with PTA, SAC, and all instructional staff. Needs analysis are conducted and input is received from these various groups to identify strengths and opportunities for growth and then incorporated into the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team reviews student data throughout the year and closely monitors student progress. The school leadership teamwork with grade-level and content area Professional Learning Communities to implement research-based, high-yield strategies to improve student achievement. Ongoing progress is shared with PTA, SAC, and all instructional staff. Through the multiple assessments and data points, we monitor and evaluate our progress towards achieving the goals of the SIP.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	26	20	17	14	17	19	33	45	36	227	
One or more suspensions	8	4	2	9	5	8	47	43	44	170	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	25	31	26	46	31	197	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	13	24	9	22	11	114	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	13	6	38	25	31	26	46	31	228	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	0	1	3	9	4	18	33	27	98

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	5	1	2	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	25	24	10	13	10	13	33	32	38	198	
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	6	4	9	40	36	46	148	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	15	14	20	33	38	140	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	7	15	30	21	17	115	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	25	20	15	14	20	33	38	167	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	8	2	3	1	19	26	33	95

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	25	24	10	13	10	13	33	32	38	198	
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	6	4	9	40	36	46	148	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	15	14	20	33	38	140	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	7	15	30	21	17	115	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	25	20	15	14	20	33	38	167	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	8	2	3	1	19	26	33	95

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	66	72	53	69	75	55	70		
ELA Learning Gains				55			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			44		
Math Achievement*	76	78	55	76	45	42	74		
Math Learning Gains				72			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			50		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	70	74	52	72	81	54	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	79	68	87	71	59	80		
Middle School Acceleration	66	71	70	64	56	51	79		
Graduation Rate		82	74		73	50			
College and Career Acceleration		32	53		89	70			
ELP Progress	78	70	55		70	70			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	47			
HSP	69			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	75			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	52			
HSP	69			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	66			76			70	88	66			78
SWD	36			42			32				4	
ELL	53			47							3	78
AMI												
ASN	81			87			100		90		4	
BLK	54			54			40				4	
HSP	70			76			64		67		5	
MUL	58			80			66		60		5	
PAC												
WHT	66			76			72	91	64		7	70
FRL	51			61			45		41		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	69	55	46	76	72	56	72	87	64			
SWD	31	35	32	43	51	43	30	61				
ELL	67			83								
AMI												
ASN	81	68		92	88		71	100	75			
BLK	52	49	33	59	61	46	48	67				
HSP	73	60	53	77	75	57	84	94	52			
MUL	67	45	38	65	68	48	74		46			
PAC												
WHT	69	55	47	76	71	59	73	85	66			
FRL	58	59	55	64	71	55	65	72	50			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	70	61	44	74	63	50	65	80	79			
SWD	32	38	36	40	41	35	25	40				
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	76	74		86	70		58	82	82			
BLK	53	61		46	41		54					
HSP	66	59	32	72	53	40	63	86	75			
MUL	70	48		78	81		53	88				
PAC												
WHT	70	62	47	75	64	50	67	78	78			
FRL	64	52	47	58	59	40	60	75				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	71%	-6%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	69%	-11%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	47%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	76%	-2%	58%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	70%	-8%	47%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	72%	-8%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	79%	81%	-2%	54%	25%
07	2023 - Spring	56%	66%	-10%	48%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	78%	-10%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	79%	6%	61%	24%
08	2023 - Spring	84%	81%	3%	55%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	74%	4%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	71%	0%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	70%	-2%	51%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	78%	22%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	67%	33%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	85%	-2%	66%	17%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our ELA performance was lower than our math performance. However, our K-2 combined scores were above the district average. In addition, our grades 3-8 combined scores for growth were the same as the district's average and the percent meeting or exceeding the standard is 14% points above the state average. We will continue focus on improvements in ELA.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our data is comparable to previous year's performance and longitudinal data.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our ELA performance was 14% higher than the state average. Our Math performance was 22% points higher than the state average. Although our performance in both areas exceeded the state's

performance, we will continue to work on improving our performance in ELA, Math, and all content areas.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our math performance exceeded the state average by 22% points. We focused on small group instruction to meet the specific needs of students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We had 197 students grades 3-8 that received a level 1. This is approximately 13% of the students that took the state assessment.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Accelerate learning and close achievement gaps for bottom quartile. Accelerate learning for all students. Exceed performance goals for ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, and EOCs assessments.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historically, our learning gains for our bottom quartile in ELA are one of the lowest areas of performance. Grade-level teams will implement differentiated instructional strategies to meet the specific needs of students to accelerate their learning. Grade-level (collaborative teams) will plan and implement standards-based differentiated lessons planned, implement, and monitored through the PLC process.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in ELA by 4% as measured by the FAST this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 4% as measured by STAR this school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), Progress Monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Job-embedded professional development during collaborative team planning.

Person Responsible: Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the ILC, Testing Coordinator, and administrative team.

Person Responsible: Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historically, our learning gains for our bottom quartile in math are one of the lowest areas of performance. Grade-level teams will implement differentiated instructional strategies to meet the specific needs of students to accelerate their learning. Grade-level (collaborative teams) will plan and implement standards-based differentiated lessons planned, implement, and monitored through the PLC process.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in math by 5% as measured by the FAST this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 5% as measured by STAR this school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), progress monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Job-embedded professional development during collaborative team planning.

Person Responsible: Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the ILC, Testing Coordinator, and administrative team.

Person Responsible: Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A consistent behavioral intervention program throughout the school and all grades is important to develop lifelong learners who make responsible choices. Behavioral incidents are just one indicator of student success, as indicated by our Early Warning System. Our Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) Team will work to revise our behavioral program to better serve our students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will reduce behavioral incidents by 5% by the end of the 2023 - 2024 SY.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Our PBIS team will review monthly behavior data in eSP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Loughran (jill.loughran@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize PBIS and Character Counts as the foundational approach to behavioral interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS and Character Counts are research-based programs that have demonstrated over time to be effective with students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Revise PBIS Plan.

Person Responsible: Jill Loughran (jill.loughran@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before the start of the school year.

Ongoing PBIS training will be provided to committee members who will share the strategies with their colleagues.

Person Responsible: Lisa Sclafani (lisa.sclafani@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Create consistent behavioral expectations throughout school and train teachers.

Person Responsible: Jill Loughran (jill.loughran@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before the start of school and throughout the school year.

Meet monthly to review data. Make adjustments as needed. Review behavioral expectations at strategic points throughout the school year and conduct in-depth refreshers for students with behavioral challenges.

Person Responsible: David Barnes (david.barnes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities is one of our lowest performing subgroups. The students in this subgroup are also in our bottom quartile for ELA and math.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with disabilities will reach 50% proficiency and learning gains in ELA and math as measured by the FAST this school year. Students with disabilities in K-2 will increase performance and gains by 5% measured by STAR.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), progress monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create time throughout the week for general education and ESE teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the ILC, Testing Coordinator, administrative team, and Achievement Coach.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

School improvement is highly connected to teacher and leadership improvement. With a focus on instructional leadership, our team will be able to support our teachers and staff to better meet the needs of our students and accelerate their learning.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in ELA by 4% as measured by the FAST this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 4% as measured by STAR this school year. MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in math by 5% as measured by the FSAT this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 5% as measured by STAR this school year. Students with disabilities will reach 50% proficiency and learning gains in ELA and math as measured by the FAST this school year. Students with disabilities in K-2 will increase performance and gains by 5% measured by STAR.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), progress monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our instructional leadership team will actively engage in the Professional Learning Community process with our teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning of school year

The instructional leadership team will participate in the PLCs with our teachers.

Person Responsible: Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout school year.