

St. Johns County School District

Ocean Palms Elementary School



2023-24

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	16
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

Ocean Palms Elementary School

355 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

<http://www-ope.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 Ocean Palms we inspire students to explore and develop their strengths and passions. We focus on integrity, leadership, and service above self. We commit to fostering a positive, safe, nurturing environment with an emphasis on academic rigor, the arts, athletics, and technology within a vibrant, caring community.

- Our focus is the child.

School Motto - Everyday. Everyone. Everything matters!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ocean Palms Elementary is where students become leaders:

Lead by example

Encourage others

Accepts challenges

Do the right thing

Explore their passions

Reflect on learning

Strive for academic excellence

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
Cantwell, Tiffany	Principal	<p>The Core Leadership Team is designated as a working group consisting of the Principal, Assistant Principals, School Counselor, School Psychologist, and Instructional Literacy Coach. They provide data on RtI/MTSS procedures and goals as well as input regarding academic and behavioral areas that need to be addressed and levels of support for students. The Leadership Team receives annual training from the district and continues to receive ongoing training throughout the year. Professional Learning for RtI/MTSS is conducted for the staff on an ongoing basis. The Leadership Team then evaluates additional staff professional development needs during weekly PLC meetings throughout the year.</p> <p>The school principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, provide continual guidance and support for the effective implementation of RtI. The principal also works closely with the school's Safety Committee to ensure the safety of all our school's students and staff so that meaningful instruction can take place. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.</p>
Cantrell, Lucie	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Beish, Gracie	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Pantano, Julie	Instructional Coach	<p>Instructional Literacy Coach: Develops, leads, and evaluates school content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		approaches. 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. Managing current Rtl student data, fidelity checks, and key communicator of the Rtl process between teachers, parents, and students.
Pellegrino, Olivia	School Counselor	Mrs. Pellegrino over sees the following grade levels: PreK, Kindergarten, First, and Second. She provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child’s academic emotional, behavioral, and social success. The school counselors also work side by side with the Instructional Coach to assist with data collection, fidelity checks, and Rtl conferences.
Proietto, Michael	School Counselor	Mr. Proietto over sees the following grade levels: Third, Fourth, Fifth and Self-contained Varying Exceptionalities classes. She provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child’s academic emotional, behavioral, and social success. The school counselors also work side by side with the Instructional Coach to assist with data collection, fidelity checks, and Rtl conferences.
Sherwood, Shannon	Psychologist	Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision-making activities.

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 Advisory Council (SAC) in cooperation with the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meet monthly to review the students' and school's needs. The plan is reviewed annually, and feedback is collected in our annual Needs Assessment Survey. SAC and PTO meetings are posted and advertised monthly. Members of the SAC committee are chosen to reflect the demographic makeup of the school. All stakeholders are given an opportunity to volunteer to be members. Monthly meetings are open to anyone who is interested in attending. Input from all stakeholders is documented in the meeting notes.

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 Core Leadership/Literacy Team meets weekly to review students' needs and school data. Leadership members participate in weekly PLC meetings with teachers to review class and grade level data. All data is shared with the Core Team. The Core Team works to assist teachers in problem solving and providing interventions to students in needs. Grade level and school data is then shared with all stakeholders at SAC and PTO meetings.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	10%
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	22	17	11	9	13	11	0	0	0	83	
One or more suspensions	3	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	4	14	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	8	19	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	15	15	22	23	0	0	0	89	

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	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	6

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	5	0	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) 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	14	9	10	10	14	9	0	0	0	66	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	3	9	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	4	10	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	2	6	4	7	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	14	9	10	10	14	9	0	0	0	66	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	3	9	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	4	10	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	2	6	4	7	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
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*	75	70	53	79	74	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				68			78		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			70		
Math Achievement*	78	73	59	81	50	50	84		
Math Learning Gains				77			77		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			78		
Science Achievement*	78	69	54	80	77	59	82		
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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	80			
MUL	81			
PAC				

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%
WHT	77			
FRL	64			

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	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	50			
HSP	77			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	46			

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	75			78			78					
SWD	37			44			43				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	78			88			86				4	
BLK	27			36							2	
HSP	79			77			74				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
MUL	72			89							2	
PAC												
WHT	75			78			78				4	
FRL	63			54			67				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	79	68	62	81	77	54	80					
SWD	46	58	50	52	64	50	36					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	83	50		93	94		82					
BLK	56			44								
HSP	72	68		82	81		82					
MUL	64	73		67	70							
PAC												
WHT	81	70	70	82	77	59	81					
FRL	57	56	45	43	44	29						

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	85	78	70	84	77	78	82					
SWD	54	44	45	54	68	75	65					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	87			91								
BLK	69			23								
HSP	82	75		76	67		75					
MUL	71			86								
PAC												
WHT	87	80	76	87	82	78	88					

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
FRL												

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	79%	71%	8%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	76%	2%	58%	20%
06	2023 - Spring	*	70%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	74%	72%	2%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	81%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	80%	78%	2%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	79%	4%	61%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	74%	2%	55%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	78%	70%	8%	51%	27%

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 students with disabilities (SWD) demonstrated the lowest performance in the area of reading. Based on progress monitoring data students are making progress toward their goals but have not reached proficiency yet.

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

Our African American (AA) subgroup demonstrated the greatest decline in the area of reading from the prior year. Based on progress monitoring data students are making progress toward their goals but have not reached proficiency yet.

Possible contributing factors to the significant decrease in performance data for students in the subgroup areas (SWD) and (AA) may be new ELA state-wide standards and new ELA curriculum.

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 students, including our subgroups exceeded district and state averages in all academic areas.

Teachers work collaboratively in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) developing common formative and summative assessments. They also review students' data to drive instructional decisions. Administration attends meetings and team leaders document data and next steps with agendas and minutes.

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

Our students were able to maintain their overall performance in reading, math, and science within 1 to 2 percentage points. We are maintaining our course of action from the previous year with the addition of SAAVAS intervention materials for our subgroup students.

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

Our goal is to reduce the number of students scoring at a level 1 or 2 in the area of reading.

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

To increase the proficiency levels of all students in the area of reading.

To increase the proficiency levels of all students in the area of math.

To increase students' overall ability to communicate their thoughts through the writing process.

To increase proficiency levels of all students in the area science.

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.

Students are struggling in the areas of reading and writing when transitioning from primary to intermediate grade levels. We see a decline in overall ELA scores from primary to secondary grade levels. To remedy this situation, we have implemented school wide writing expectations correlated to reading and early phonics intervention in primary grade levels. Reading and writing is an act of composing that engages students in observation, imagining, questioning, and reflection. When composing students make connections that strengthens their understanding of the content. By focusing on reading and writing across content areas and early intervention in phonics our goal is to increase students' comprehension, learning gains in all content areas, and students' need from the data overall communication skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase our overall ELA proficiency by 3% on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will participate in professional learning with our Instructional Literacy Coach and district's curriculum team. They will receive feedback regarding their instructional practice from our leadership team during their PLC meetings and classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@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.)

Teachers will implement district approved curriculum and interventions. Teachers will explicitly teach students how to identify and summarize critical content across all content areas. Students will be given frequent opportunities for evidence-based discussions and writing to support well defended claims about text. Students will respond to questions and tasks that demonstrate their abilities to explain their thinking about key elements and central ideas of texts and produce specific reasons for their thoughts that are grounded in evidence. Students in primary grades will explicitly be taught phonics daily using district approved curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are struggling in the areas of reading and writing when transitioning from primary to intermediate grade levels. We see a decline in overall ELA scores from primary to secondary grade levels.

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.

To increase overall student performance, we have implemented school wide writing expectations correlated to reading and early phonics intervention in primary grade levels.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

To maintain a positive school culture and environment our school focuses on positive reinforcement and recognition for good character. All staff members are trained on school wide expectations and use the same verbiage to reinforce positive behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All staff members distribute positive paws to students throughout the school day. Students submit their positive paws to the library for a weekly drawing to earn swag tags and the opportunity to go to our school store, The Otter Outpost.

Monitoring:

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

We track the number of positive paws distributed to students each month and compare it by grade level to our discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lucie Cantrell (lucie.cantrell@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.)

All teachers shall implement a positive reinforcement plan in their classrooms throughout the day and teach students appropriate replacement behaviors. Our Guidance Counselors also provide Character Counts lessons to reinforce the pillars of good character.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive reinforcement is effective because it creates a pleasant and rewarding experience that encourages the desired behavior to be repeated. It also increases motivation and self-confidence and can help to establish positive habits and routines. These strategies are rooted in our school wide PBIS program and Character Counts.

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.

All teachers shall follow our school wide expectations and implement a positive reinforcement plan in their classroom throughout the day. Our Guidance Counselors also provide Character Counts lessons to reinforce the pillars of good character.

Person Responsible: Lucie Cantrell (lucie.cantrell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

The teaching profession has experienced a decrease in applicants and also attrition over the last four years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our school plans to retain all of our teachers this school year.

Monitoring:

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

Feedback and supports will be offered to all teachers through scheduled planning days and monthly coaching meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Pantano (julie.pantano@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.)

Teacher support and professional development will be provided and differentiated for all teachers to meet their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We recognize that there are diverse needs for each grade level as well as new versus veteran teachers.

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.

To schedule three additional planning days (TDE) for each grade level throughout the school year. In addition to the TDE days all category 1 teachers will participate in monthly coaching meetings and anyone new to our school or those who changed a grade level will participate in peer observations.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#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.

Our goal is to close the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to increase SWD in the area of ELA achievement by 3%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through the PLC process using common assessments and FAST progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@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.)

Students will receive instructional interventions outside of their core academic block. PLC team planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessments, FAST data, observations. Use of the SAAVAS curriculum resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need instruction in both grade level content and areas they demonstrate gaps in academic 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.

Students' schedules were specifically reviewed to ensure they are group appropriately for support services and their schedule allows for the maximum amount of time in the classroom for grade level content.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023