Durbin Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Durbin Creek Elementary School

4100 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-dce.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 mission of Durbin Creek Elementary is to make positive contributions to society by expanding minds to explore our expanding world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Durbin Creek Elementary School will promote a positive educational environment conducive to learning. We will promote respect, caring and a sense of community. Durbin Creek Elementary will develop an atmosphere where students develop a strong desire to learn, excel, and develop excellent character.

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
McCormick, Ashley	Principal	Facilitating the development of the SIP, assigning responsibilities, monitoring progress towards the SIP
Hamelin, Jessica	Assistant Principal	LEA PreK-2 PLC facilitator/monitoring Testing Coordinator Prek-2 MTSS School Contact
Kling, Gwendolyn	Assistant Principal	LEA 3-5 Testing Coordinator 3-5 ESOL School contact PLC facilitator/monitoring
Slater, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Professional Learning Contact MTSS lead Literacy Leadership team PLC support and monitoring Interventionist
McDonald, Rachel	School Counselor	Student Services, Intervention, direct instruction in Character building
Rodgers, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student Services, intervention, direct instruction in Character building

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 process begins with our Leadership team. We end each year with a reflection piece and begin to identify areas of focus. Once we receive our Spring data results, we fine-tune our goals. Feedback is taken from team leaders, PTO, SAC and is combined with leadership focus. Once all pieces are received, we begin to set a focus for the upcoming year. This includes aligning Professional Learning. The goal is to have very aligned and focused Professional Learning.

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

The Leadership team participates in every Professional Learning Community on campus. This is where teams analyze data, plan and monitor interventions. They are able to monitor student progress closely. We look at state data as well as data gained from common assessments which are embedded in curriculum maps. We constantly adjust in response to what our students are showing us. This is done through PLCs working together with the Instructional coach as well as administration. In addition, our leadership team meets weekly with our ESE Achievement Coach and School Psychologist. Here, we discuss data trends and student needs. We are careful to consider barriers to student learning. We work together to remove these barriers once identified.

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	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	14%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	26	19	13	6	10	6	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	4	7	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	6	6	0	0	0	21
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	

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	4	4	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	12	15	6	4	10	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	23
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	12
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	7	12	15	6	4	10	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	23
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	12
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*	78	70	53	81	74	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				66			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			57		
Math Achievement*	84	73	59	85	50	50	87		
Math Learning Gains				77			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			71		
Science Achievement*	84	69	54	77	77	59	80		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	66	59	59			83		

* 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](https://www.floridacims.org).

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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	45			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	67			
HSP	69			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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	57			

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	47			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	71			
HSP	56			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	54			

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	78			84			84					58
SWD	42			47			53				4	
ELL	52			76							4	58
AMI												
ASN	91			98			100				4	
BLK	62			71							2	
HSP	67			77			70				4	
MUL	81			84			92				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	77			81			82				4	
FRL	56			67			68				5	64

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	81	66	55	85	77	68	77					59
SWD	40	45	42	55	64	61	24					
ELL	61	47		71	80		50					59
AMI												
ASN	96	85		97	85		83					
BLK	71			71								
HSP	67	44	44	71	55	56	53					
MUL	86	42		86	89		70					
PAC												
WHT	81	69	54	86	78	68	81					
FRL	65	51	44	65	61	50	43					

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	81	66	57	87	71	71	80					83
SWD	47	42	38	53	65	64	39					
ELL	64			73								83
AMI												
ASN	94	70		96	75		81					
BLK	67			58								
HSP	71	64		81	86		69					
MUL	74			93								
PAC												
WHT	81	69	53	87	71	75	85					
FRL	69	69		71	56		53					

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	81%	71%	10%	54%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	72%	0%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	81%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	79%	78%	1%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	79%	8%	61%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	86%	74%	12%	55%	31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	83%	70%	13%	51%	32%

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.

We have identified two areas which trend on the lower side. The first is focused on Students with Disabilities. In grades 3-5 for ELA, 46% of SWD scored a level 3 or above on state testing. We see similar trends in K-2. When we drill down further, we identify third grade as an area of focus. This is the third year we have fallen below 40% (38%) for SWD in this grade. The thought is that perhaps we are not intervening early enough and are in need of a more targeted approach.
The second area presenting low is the ELA data for our Kindergarten students. Proficiency levels were below the district average. Early intervention has to be the focus here as well.

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

This year we do not have specific comparison data as we used new state assessments. With that being understood, we are taking a close look at our Kindergarten data. Initially the logistics of the new assessment were challenging, however, we did expect more growth to be seen among this group. Their proficient level is below the district average. We have identified some instructional practices which may have contributed to the lower scores.

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.

At this time, with the data provided, we do not have a significant gap with the state data. Our 3-5 data, which is available, is all above the state average.

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

Without being able to analyze learning gains due to a new assessment piece, it is difficult to identify areas of improvement. Our trends do appear to remain consistent. Math in grades 3-5 is a strength and we are pleased with many of the results we see. One action we have taken is allowing more Professional Learning in this area. We have seen an increase in the number of teachers participating in CGI training with Florida State University. This has a big impact on student learning in math. In addition, we are working towards a more targeted approach to interventions in math, trying to mirror them with ELA interventions.

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

Attendance has been an area of concern. We see a high number of absences among students, particularly in the primary years. This missed instruction raises concern.

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

1. Strengthening PLC work
2. Aligned Professional Learning
3. Targeted intervention
4. Closer, more frequent monitoring of student progress
5. Improvement in feedback given to teachers through observation cycle

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 Professional Learning Communities

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 deepening PLC work, we will focus on implementing evidence-based interventions through small group instruction. A focus will be on common assessments and professional learning to support effective small group instruction.

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

We will use baseline data gained from progress monitoring 1 and set a specific goal through work with the MTSS and Leadership teams.
Overall, from data last spring, we would like to see a 2% gain in overall ELA proficiency (FAST data) in grades 3-5.

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

The MTSS Core team will collaborate to monitor the effectiveness of intervention/small group instruction. Data collected through common assessments will be a link to progress. The team will monitor the fidelity of interventions through observation. The leadership team will also make this an area of focus and give feedback during observational rounds.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@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.)

A focus will be on the high yield strategy of effective feedback. We must provide effective and timely feedback to teachers. This will be done through MTSS protocols with the Instructional Coach and ESE Achievement Coach. The area will be a focus in observation rounds with the leadership team as well.

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

We can provide the professional learning; however, the monitor piece must be tight. Support needs to be in the classrooms and coupled with feedback. Research shows effective, timely and specific feedback produces high results.

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.

Monitor fidelity of interventions through observation and PLC

Person Responsible: Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly throughout the year

Share data from common assessments and state assessments at least quarterly with the MTSS and leadership teams. The team will monitor and create an action plan in response to data analyzed.

Person Responsible: Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By May- ongoing, quarterly

Leadership team will analyze data gained from instructional observations and create an action plan in response.

Person Responsible: Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, monthly through May

#2. 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.

As a school grows to over 1,000 students and additional staff, teacher observation practices must be revisited and fine-tuned. Administration gets pulled in many ways and it can sometimes be challenging to deliver timely and effective feedback from instructional observations. In order for teachers to again a sense of support and collaboration, strong and effective feedback and availability has to be implemented. This in turn helps develop a sense of connection.

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

A defined observation schedule will be developed with timelines and strategies for effective feedback. Increase the number of feedback/coaching cycles from observational data by 100%. Ensure all staff receives.

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

Administration team will meet weekly to discuss observations and review timelines. We will hold one another accountable.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@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.)

Effective feedback is a high yield strategy. Using research-based strategies for feedback will aid in the retention of teachers.

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

Teachers feel supported when we can take the time to give effective feedback and allow for open discussion. We feel this strengthens the team approach and can positively impact classroom 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.

Monitor observation cycle. Debrief with leadership team after each cycle.

Person Responsible: Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, through May.

Research effective feedback practices.

Person Responsible: Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: November

#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.

As we monitor data trends, we see there is a specific age group within our SWD subgroup which yields less growth. The focus is on ELA. For three years we were seeing a decrease in ELA achievement levels in third grade. This year we saw this subgroup below the 40% threshold once again. A pattern has emerged, and it is important to identify the contributing factors. We must dissect our instructional practices. The team has identified a need for a stronger, more defined bridge between second and third grade. We also believe we should continue the previous focus on small group instruction.

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

Increase ELA proficiency of third grade SWD subgroup by 5% on state assessment.

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

The MTSS and ESE teams will collaborate and closely monitor the subgroup. The teams will work in collaboration with our Instructional Coach and ESE Achievement Coach. All will participate in the grade level PLC as well. Data will be reviewed monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Hamelin (jessica.hamelin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Professional Learning will be offered (research-based interventions and high yield strategies). This will be paired with strategies for monitoring the effectiveness of each intervention. Timely and effective feedback will be given to teachers by the administrative team.

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

It has been observed teachers don't always feel confident with next steps for struggling learners. We must provide professional learning and monitor the fidelity and consistency of research-based interventions. Learning should be on-going throughout the year.

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.

Monitor fidelity of interventions.

Person Responsible: Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, through May

Share monthly and quarterly data with the MTSS team, analyze and problem solve.

Person Responsible: Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

#4. 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.

We continue to see students display undesirable behaviors and behaviors not typically seen in past years. Resiliency is also an area for improvement. Discipline referrals show an area of focus remains in social regulation skills, identifying and handling emotions and communicating needs and emotions appropriately. There is a high need for direct instruction and practical application opportunities in this area.

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

Decrease student discipline referrals by 5%.

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

Leadership team in collaboration with the MTSS team will monitor discipline data and RTI behavior plans monthly. The number of Mental Health referrals will also be monitored closely. An online system for referrals will be implemented which will enrich the monitoring piece.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gwendolyn Kling (gwendolyn.kling@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.)

Implementing a weekly schedule for School Counselors to provide direct instruction in Character Counts and focus areas. Through the cycle, opportunities for practice will be provided.

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

In the past, we often react to individual students. We must build capacity in the whole student body and become more proactive than reactionary. A common language is needed. From there we can be sure to build on the skills learned from year to year. A research-based curriculum will be used as the launching point.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Create schedule which allows weekly contact and instruction with School Counselors.

Person Responsible: Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Counselors collaborate with administration and district to identify research-based practices and curriculum.

Person Responsible: Rachel McDonald (rachel.mcdonald@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Build and plan quarterly celebration schedule to reward students displaying good character.

Person Responsible: Gwendolyn Kling (gwendolyn.kling@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Monitor and analyze school-wide disciple referrals.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hamelin (jessica.hamelin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, through May