Ponte Vedra Palm Valley Rawlings Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Ponte Vedra Palm Valley Rawlings Elementary School

610 US HIGHWAY A1A N, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

http://www-pvmkr.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.

The faculty and staff of PVPV/Rawlings Elementary support the St. Johns County School District's mission to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world. We will "Work Hard, Be Kind, and Be Awesome!"

Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of PVPV/Rawlings Elementary support the St. Johns County School District's vision statement that all students will abide by the six Pillars of Character: Citizenship, Responsibility, Trustworthiness, Fairness, Caring and Respect.

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
Gates, Jesse	Principal	The school principal guides the vision for the use of data-based decision-making, provides continual oversight and support for the effective implementation of the MTSS process, and creates the framework for PLC team analysis of student achievement and instructional strategies for remediation and intervention. The principal also works closely with the school's Safety Committee to ensure the safety of all our school's 1,025 students, so that meaningful instruction can take place. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.
Whaley, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals evaluate and provide feedback to faculty about their instructional practices. Both assistant principals work closely with the principal and guidance counselors to evaluate and support all students identified by the Early Warning System, plus lower quartile achievers in reading and math, and develop academic and social/emotional support plans for struggling students to ensure nobody slips through the gaps. APs also are responsible for providing curriculum resources for all teachers, and for ensuring alignment between state standards and instructional practices. The Assistant principal also serves as LEA.
Hillier, Jill	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals evaluate and provide feedback to faculty about their instructional practices. Both assistant principals work closely with the principal and guidance counselors to evaluate and support all students identified by the Early Warning System, plus lower quartile achievers in reading and math, and develop academic and social/emotional support plans for struggling students to ensure nobody slips through the gaps. APs also are responsible for providing curriculum resources for all teachers, and for ensuring alignment between state standards and instructional practices. The Assistant principal also serves as LEA.
Woolston, Christopher	Instructional Coach	The instructional literacy coach identifies and analyzes existing scientifically based curriculum and behavior assessment and intervention approaches. She identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole-school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be 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; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. The ILC manages current MTSS student data and fidelity checks and serves as key communicator of the MTSS process between teachers, parents, and students.

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.

School Leadership team met and reviewed the 2022-2023 SIP plan and revised for this year as needed.

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))

We will review progress monitoring data from the FAST testing to ensure we are in alignment with our 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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	12%
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) 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	13	7	4	6	13	9	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	9	8	19	13	18	0	0	0	70

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	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	7

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	4	7	5	5	5	7	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	11	16	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	10	11	16	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	1	4	2	7	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	4	7	5	5	5	7	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	11	16	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	10	11	16	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	1	4	2	7	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	86	70	53	84	74	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				78			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			63		
Math Achievement*	92	73	59	90	50	50	86		
Math Learning Gains				85			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				81			76		
Science Achievement*	85	69	54	82	77	59	81		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	59						

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	88
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	567
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	72			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	75			
HSP	73			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	90			

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%
FRL	71			

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	59			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	57			
HSP	68			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	72			

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	86			92			85					
SWD	71			74			59				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	95			90							2	
BLK	78			72							2	
HSP	70			83			67				4	
MUL	87			90			79				4	

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
PAC												
WHT	87			93			89				4	
FRL	68			78			65				4	

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	84	78	67	90	85	81	82					
SWD	55	54	53	69	68	71	46					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	93			100								
BLK	50			63								
HSP	70	43	50	84	86	86	59					
MUL	85	72		85	84							
PAC												
WHT	86	81	72	92	85	85	85					
FRL	65	69	55	76	81	91	67					

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	84	69	63	86	84	76	81					
SWD	53	45	39	60	72	71	46					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	88			100								
BLK	45			70								
HSP	65	64		68	75		71					
MUL	91			75								
PAC												
WHT	87	71	68	88	84	74	82					
FRL	68	75		70	63	60	60					

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	82%	71%	11%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	92%	76%	16%	58%	34%
03	2023 - Spring	87%	72%	15%	50%	37%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	93%	78%	15%	59%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	93%	79%	14%	61%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	93%	74%	19%	55%	38%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	86%	70%	16%	51%	35%

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.

Closing the achievement gap with our SWD.

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

Focus on the achievement gap with our SWD.

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.

We have a gap between our SWD proficiency and general education students.

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

Math proficiency in 5th grade.

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

There is still a significant achievement gap between our SWD and our general education students.

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

Students with Disabilities. ELA growth of lowest quartile. Math growth lowest quartile.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Focus on creating a positive workplace environment.

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

Implement three positive workplace initiatives throughout the year. 1. Implement a Burn Bootcamp available for employees after school 2. Work with PTO to have 3 food trucks for staff this year. 3. Implement 8 staff meeting throughout the year with gift card incentives

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

We will input these events on the calendar.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

We will use active monitoring and feedback from the staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It's important to create a working environment teachers and staff want to be a part of.

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.

Plan Food trucks for year for staff retention.

Person Responsible: Jesse Gates (jesse.gates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Sept 30

Plan staff meetings with gift-card auctions

Person Responsible: Jesse Gates (jesse.gates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 30

Implement employee wellness activity.

Person Responsible: Jesse Gates (jesse.gates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Sept 30

#2. 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.

We want to continue our focus on ELA proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains of lowest quartile.

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

Learning Gains of the lowest quartile will improve to 80%

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

Our WIN times along with SAI tutors will be used to provide interventions for students in lowest quartile. Weekly PLC meetings taking place on Wednesdays will be devoted to identifying students in lowest quartile, identifying specific weaknesses, and planning interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Woolston (christopher.woolston@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.)

Clear lesson goals are identified as an evidence-based strategy that will help us focus on skills and strategies in phonics and comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Clear lesson goals are identified as an evidence-based strategy that will help us focus on skills and strategies in phonics and comprehension.

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.

Identify the lowest quartile

Person Responsible: Christopher Woolston (christopher.woolston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By September 15th

Identify weaknesses and design interventions

Person Responsible: Christopher Woolston (christopher.woolston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 30

Arrange WIN time and tutor interventions.

Person Responsible: Christopher Woolston (christopher.woolston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 30

Monitor progress through FAST/STAR testing

Person Responsible: Christopher Woolston (christopher.woolston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Continuously

#3. 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.

The achievement gap between our general education students and our SWD was over 30 percent.

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

Increase SWD proficiency in ELA to 55%.

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

Students will be monitored with FAST testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 WIN times along with ESE teachers will be used to provide interventions and acceleration opportunities for SWD. Weekly PLC meetings taking place on Wednesdays will be devoted to identifying students in lowest quartile, identifying specific weaknesses, and planning interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The WIN time will focus on student intervention for ESE students. Wilson interventions will be provided to students needing phonics instruction.

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.

SWD needs identified

Person Responsible: Rebecca Whaley (rebecca.whaley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15

ESE teachers will collaborate and plan with general education teachers during PLC.

Person Responsible: Jill Hillier (jill.hillier@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15

Acceleration interventions and phonics will be provided to students identified.

Person Responsible: Christopher Woolston (christopher.woolston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15