Cunningham Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cunningham Creek Elementary School

1205 ROBERTS RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-ccs.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 Caring Cardinals of Cunningham Creek will build strong bodies, hearts, minds, and spirits so we can live, love, learn, and lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cunningham Creek Elementary School is a community of Caring Cardinals, committed to creating an atmosphere that encourages students to develop to their greatest potential. Through our commitment to Communicating, Caring and achieving Excellence, all Cardinals will soar with a passion for lifelong learning.

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
OConnell, Katherine	Principal	Lead the school in determining areas of focus Provide resources and remove obstacles Support the faculty and staff Partner with the families and community Encourage and motivate students Lead CORE team Serve on MTSS problem solving team
Yeoman, Lydia	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school initiatives Focus and support the ESE programs Provide school wide guidance and support to all stakeholders Serve on MTSS team
Ritchie, Christa	Instructional Coach	Serve on MTSS team Provide training, coaching and support to all instructional staff Facilitate mentoring program Guide and direct curricular decisions and instructional frameworks
	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school initiatives Provide school wide guidance and support to all stakeholders Facilitate transportation and safety programs Serve on MTSS team

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 stakeholders are involved in all aspects of school performance and improvement. Teachers, staff, parents, students and business partners work together to review and analyze performance data and determine goals and actions. Schoolwide performance data is shared with our school community and parents and teachers are surveyed for input and response. Our SAC reviews the SIP and provides input and participates in ongoing progress monitoring. Our community stakeholders support our positive culture goals as well by particpating in community events, providing recognition, and funding rewards.

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))

Our SIP is regularly monitored through weekly PLCs on grade level teams where they analyze students performance and provide progress monitoring on specific grade level goals. Our CORE team regularly monitors student information inlcuding discipline data, EWS reports, Threat Assessment and behavior and mental health referrals in weekly team meetings to identify patterns and or areas of concern. SIP data and progress reports are shared in monthly SAC and PTO meetings to engage business partners and families in our progress. If th eplan needs to be revised, the school leaders adjust the plan and communicate changes to stakeholders.

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	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	14%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	9	7	4	9	9	8	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	4	2	0	11	6	6	0	0	0	29
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	17	0	0	0	24
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	7	8	1	5	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	4	5	6	0	0	0	16

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	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	6	5	9	3	11	8	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	7	2	6	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	7	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	3	6	9	4	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	6	5	9	3	11	8	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	7	2	6	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	7	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	3	6	9	4	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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*	70	70	53	75	74	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				67			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			44		
Math Achievement*	69	73	59	79	50	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				63			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			63		
Science Achievement*	67	69	54	77	77	59	60		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	67			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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	41			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	73			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	42			

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	70			69			67					
SWD	34			29			25				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			50							2	
HSP	62			65			75				3	
MUL	61			74							2	

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	73			69			67				4	
FRL	44			36			42				3	

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	75	67	47	79	63	44	77					
SWD	38	40	27	47	46	41	31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			64								
HSP	71	81		82	56							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	69	44	81	64	46	77					
FRL	48	56	38	50	39	23						

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	73	59	44	79	58	63	60					
SWD	40	27		46	47		33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	55			82								
BLK												
HSP	70			87								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	74	61	38	79	56	62	65					
FRL	45	30		44	50		21					

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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide</u>
<u>assessments</u>.

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	72%	71%	1%	54%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	76%	-1%	58%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	72%	-3%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	78%	-8%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	79%	-7%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	74%	-2%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	70%	-2%	51%	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.

ESSA Subgroup SWD performed the lowest at 39%. Accountability componenets for SWD included 38% ELA, 27% ELA LG 25%, 41% Math LG 25% and 31% for Science.
ESE Support Facilitation model has negatively impacted our students performance, especially in Science. Our model does not support push in for ELA or resource classes, requiring support facilitation teachers to pull students out of class and the opportunities to do so are limited. This, unfortunately, results in students being pulled out of science and social studies.

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

Our only area of decline from the previous year is in Math Lowest 25th Percentile, which was at 63% the previous year but has declined to 44%. This year was the implementation of BEST Math Standards and our district and school were adapting and working to create aligned resources that supported interventions. While we purchased supplemental platforms for support, we did not see the results expected. Our NEST groups for remediation too often focused on ELA. Our district resources and support were also heavily geared towards ELA with NWRI, Code B letters, ILC support, and a district goal focused on 3rd grade reading.

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.

There is a significant gap in performance for ELA and Math, with Cunningham Creek scoring significantly higher than the state average. I attribute this to following the standards with a well aligned curriculum and rigorous assessments. Progress monitoring has been instrumental to our growth and has really impacted student awareness of their own performance and goals.

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

Our greatest improvement was in Science Achievement, improving from a 60% to 77%. We departmentalized our 4th and 5th grade classes and the master schedule supported additional focus on Science and teaching ELA through Science. Unfortunately, as noted in question 1, our SWD did not see the same benefit.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern. Although we have seen an improvement in the last year since the pandemic, we are not seeing pre-pandemic levels of attendance. The trend of students missing whole weeks to exceeding 10 days in a semester is concerning. The discipline data and suspensions were reflective of a population that has changed this year and the high numbers of suspensions will not continue to show as a trend.

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

1. Improving SWD performance
2. Increasing our SWD Science Achievement by adjust our facilitation plan
3. Identifying opportunities for math remediation in our LQ
4. Ensuring that students enter 3rd garade on grade level in reading
5. Providing quality ELA interventions for all LQ

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.

Through our continued focus on retaining teachers, celebrating positivity, supporting teachers, and celebrating leaders we have identified a common theme of positivity and have will continue as a certified Energy Bus School.

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

Increase in student recognition, positive interactions, decrease in suspensions and improved parent participation in positive celebrations.

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

We will track the number of students and staff recognized for their positivity. We will survey parents and community members to ascertain impact on community. We will see a decrease in referrals and an increase in teacher retention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@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.)

Evidence demonstrates the effect of a positive culture and environment on academic and behavioral outcomes. Active monitoring of student behavior and recognition of student success will allow us to identify trends early and impact behaviors and outcome.

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

By implementing a culture of positivity we are developing studentswho have greater capacity for individual growth and achievement.

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.

Monthly recognition of students and staff members

Person Responsible: Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Exepectation assemblies for grades 3-5 at the start of the year and again at the start of second semester. Setting the tone for behavior expectations and the power of positivity.

Person Responsible: Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Each month, students will participate in an exciting Energy Week. During our Energy Weeks, we will recognize staff and students, participate in energy activities, and have a Spirit Day. Our staff and student recognitions include designating C.E.O.s (Chief Energy Officers) from each classroom who will be positivity
champions with their peers. We want kids excited for a positive year, full of energy and school spirit!
Part of this initiative is to invite our students, parents, community members, and business partners onto our
CCE Energy Bus.

Person Responsible: Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#2. 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.

SWD will perform above 41% on assessments for math and ELA. We are committed to our SWD subgroup reaching their potential and demonstrating their capabilities.

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

Students will improve performance by 3% in ELA and math

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

The area of focus will be monitored through grade level PLC data analysis, district common assessment results, report cards, interims, common formatives and FAST Progress Monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@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.)

Collective Teacher Efficacy -PLC- unpacking standards, using authentic assessments, creating flexible groups based on specific deficits or enrichment needs
RTI- MTSS Process
NEST & WIN Groups
Differentiated instruction within class and among grade level
Support of ESE Achievement Coach

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

Collective Teacher Efficacy has the highest yield effect on student performance. This collective partnership is implemented through our PLC process which uses data based decision making to drive 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.

Review individual student data and create an inclusive master schedule to include support facilitation

Person Responsible: Lydia Yeoman (lydia.yeoman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 20, 2023

Quarterly progress reports and progress monitoring
Analyzing growth trends quarterly to adjust instruction and intervention as needed

Person Responsible: Lydia Yeoman (lydia.yeoman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

ESSER funds are being used for supplemental resources, specifically DreamBox for math intervention and support. Additional ESSER allocations are providing a certified tutor to support grade level reading interventions.