

St. Johns County School District

Patriot Oaks Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
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

Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-poa.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.

Committed to every student every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Patriot Oaks, we are a community that fosters character development, independence and a lifelong love of 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
Chiodo, Drew	Principal	
Carlson-Bright, Dianna	Assistant Principal	
Zamparelli, Alexis	Assistant Principal	
Adkins, Lynn	Assistant Principal	
Susice, Kim	Instructional Coach	
Sierra, Mildred	School Counselor	

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 Improvement Plan was drafted by both the school-based administration team in conjunction with the Team Leaders & Guiding Coalition. Prior to it's formal development, the teams worked together to review data and craft the school goals. Data reviewed included the end of school year 22-23 SAC survey data for students, parents, and faculty, attendance data, FAST PM data, State EOC data, and ESSA subgroup data. Goals were crafted using the SMART goal framework and reviewed and modified by the collaborative team.

These goals were presented to the faculty, staff, and PTO board during pre-planning week. Further, the above leadership team reviewed these goals and drafted yearlong professional learning programming for all instructional and non-instructional staff to work towards the school goals.

These goals will be presented to the School Advisory Council by the Principal at the first meeting of the 2023-2024 school year.

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))

There are multiple tiers of SIP monitoring. First, the school-based administrative team have organized to support specific grade levels and teams. Once a week, during the pre-scheduled collaborative planning time for each team, the designated member of the administrative team will work in collaboration with the instruction staff to monitor student progress, related to the school goals, identify areas of need, and review student formative and summative progress in their specific content area.

The second tier of SIP monitoring is through the yearlong professional learning programming at POA. Each week a different collaborative team (K-8) participates in professional learning on Wednesdays using the WOW Wednesday model. Teams will receive professional learning, practice, and planning during those days. All professional learning is related to research based best practices and aligned to the SIP goals.

The third tier of SIP monitoring is through formative and evaluative feedback by the school-based administration. Throughout the course of the school year, every instructional staff member will receive at least three observations related to their instruction practice. The target element of professional learning, related to the SIP goals, will be evaluated during each evaluation to monitor staff practice and process.

The final tier of SIP monitoring is conducted through the data collection process. Two goals are specific to student academic performance, and will be actively monitored three times a year through the district PM tools. The third goal, related to student involvement and community service will be monitored with service hours and with SAC survey data conducted at the end of the school year.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	8%
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)
<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	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	10	10	6	6	3	3	13	12	19	82
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	5	10	10	15	11	18	72
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	10	5	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	21
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	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	8	4	1	4	7	13	16	26	88
One or more suspensions	1	0	10	3	6	3	6	13	22	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	11	1	9	9	8	3	3	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	3	3	22
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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	0	6	0	0	7	5	8	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	9	8	4	1	4	7	13	16	26	88
One or more suspensions	1	0	10	3	6	3	6	13	22	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	11	1	9	9	8	3	3	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	3	3	22
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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	0	6	0	0	7	5	8	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	76	72	53	80	75	55	80		
ELA Learning Gains				69			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			54		
Math Achievement*	83	78	55	85	45	42	86		
Math Learning Gains				77			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			65		
Science Achievement*	80	74	52	71	81	54	78		
Social Studies Achievement*		79	68	98	71	59	97		
Middle School Acceleration	84	71	70	79	56	51	85		
Graduation Rate		82	74		73	50			
College and Career Acceleration		32	53		89	70			
ELP Progress	60	70	55		70	70			

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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	686
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	78			
HSP	81			
MUL	68			
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	69			

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	55			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	68			
HSP	71			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	76			

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	76			83			80		84			60
SWD	37			49			38				4	
ELL	64			86							3	60
AMI												
ASN	86			93			92		98		5	
BLK	67			82			86				3	
HSP	73			79			79		92		4	
MUL	56			74			71		80		5	

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			82			78		78		5	
FRL	66			72			58		80		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	80	69	59	85	77	68	71	98	79			
SWD	52	58	52	60	61	52	31	89	44			
ELL	42			58								
AMI												
ASN	91	87		92	86	77	80	100	94			
BLK	71	72	50	67	75	70						
HSP	76	54	54	82	70	67	60	93	86			
MUL	77	81		81	78	55	64					
PAC												
WHT	80	67	58	85	76	68	73	100	76			
FRL	69	69	68	75	78	74	67	100	82			

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	80	71	54	86	72	65	78	97	85			
SWD	48	46	36	61	62	52	50	76				
ELL	58			83								
AMI												
ASN	93	91		90	79		89	100	100			
BLK	67	62	50	72	81	75	64					
HSP	74	65	41	79	60	50	68	92	94			
MUL	79	68		94	73		64					
PAC												
WHT	79	70	55	87	73	65	79	97	82			
FRL	64	50		76	57		70					

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	78%	71%	7%	54%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	69%	10%	47%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	69%	8%	47%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	76%	4%	58%	22%
06	2023 - Spring	77%	70%	7%	47%	30%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	72%	4%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	87%	81%	6%	54%	33%
07	2023 - Spring	71%	66%	5%	48%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	78%	2%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	79%	1%	61%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	94%	81%	13%	55%	39%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	74%	1%	55%	20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	78%	19%	50%	47%

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

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

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.

The area of lowest performance was POA's Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup. This subgroup was at the ESSA differentiated accountability threshold of 41%. A number of factors were discussed and reviewed as a team and include, but are not limited to: new test environment, approach to a "baseline assessment," continued attention to progress monitoring related to specific student goals, and historical progress related to SWD progress in reading and math.

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

Our largest area of decline, from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 was middle school acceleration. The team reviewed the data and determined that the major contributing factor was a change in middle school enrolment from the previous two school years. Due to county growth and rezoning, approximately 500 students were added to POA during the 2022-2023 school year and middle school schedules were impacted due to differences in progression from previous schools.

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.

All areas are at or above state averages, which is a great success for all of our students, with the exception of our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup. Students in this subgroup have, historically, struggled to make adequate and acceptable progress. Factors include identified areas of disabilities, consistency of the delivery of specially designed instruction, a change in environments between schools, new state standards, new district resources, and the professional learning gap between special education teacher and general education teacher.

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

Our most improved area was our math learning gains. The team discussed this data and attributed the growth to both cohort progress in the previous years and consistency related to math team staffing, professional learning, and understanding of the new BEST standards.

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

There are two areas of focus, specific to EWS data. The first is the level 1 proficiency of students in second grade. For the 2023-2024 school year, students are now in third grade, which is a mandatory retention year. These students have been specifically identified for intervention and support. Additionally,

the increase of absences from Kindergarten to Eighth grade is an area of focus. POA is committed to connecting with these students to ensure they find value, not only in their academic experience, but also in their community involvement.

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

- (1) SWD Progress
- (2) Increased Achievement in Reading & Math
- (3) Student involvement in school-based volunteer opportunities

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the '23- '24 school year, the schoolwide % of students showing reading proficiency will increase by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

First, the school-based administrative team have organized to support specific grade levels and teams. Once a week, during the pre-scheduled collaborative planning time for each team, the designated member of the administrative team will work in collaboration with the instruction staff to monitor student progress, related to the school goals, identify areas of need, and review student formative and summative progress in their specific content area. The second tier of SIP monitoring is through the yearlong professional learning programming at POA. Each week a different collaborative team (K-8) participates in professional learning on Wednesdays using the WOW Wednesday model. The third tier of SIP monitoring is through formative and evaluative feedback by the school-based administration. Throughout the course of the school year, every instructional staff member will receive at least three observations related to their instruction practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Begin training on research-based best practices with cooperative learning through WOW Wednesday.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/27/2023

Practice different cooperative learning strategies as a collaborative team.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/31/2023

Implement strategies learned about as a collaborative team.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 11/20/2023

Monitor student progress and adjust learned strategies learned by the collaborative team.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 5/20/2024

#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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the '23- '24 school year, students with disabilities (SWD) will increase their proficiency by 3% in ELA and Math by state and district assessment data.

Monitoring:

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

First, the school-based administrative team have organized to support specific grade levels and teams. Once a week, during the pre-scheduled collaborative planning time for each team, the designated member of the administrative team will work in collaboration with the instruction staff to monitor student progress, related to the school goals, identify areas of need, and review student formative and summative progress in their specific content area. The second tier of SIP monitoring is through the yearlong professional learning programming at POA. Each week a different collaborative team (K-8) participates in professional learning on Wednesdays using the WOW Wednesday model. The third tier of SIP monitoring is through formative and evaluative feedback by the school-based administration. Throughout the course of the school year, every instructional staff member will receive at least three observations related to their instruction practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Begin training on research-based best practices with cooperative learning through WOW Wednesday.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/27/2023

Learn and practice learned strategies.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/27/2023

Monitor student progress and adjust learned practice strategies.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 5/20/2024

#3. 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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the '23- '24 school year, 70% of students will frequently participate in helping the school or community to be a better place.

Monitoring:

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

First, the school-based administrative team have organized to support specific grade levels and teams. Once a week, during the pre-scheduled collaborative planning time for each team, the designated member of the administrative team will work in collaboration with the instruction staff to monitor student progress, related to the school goals, identify areas of need, and review student formative and summative progress in their specific content area. The second tier of SIP monitoring is through the yearlong professional learning programming at POA. Each week a different collaborative team (K-8) participates in professional learning on Wednesdays using the WOW Wednesday model. The third tier of SIP monitoring is through formative and evaluative feedback by the school-based administration. Throughout the course of the school year, every instructional staff member will receive at least three observations related to their instruction practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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 and assess current volunteer opportunities for POA students

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/27/2023

Garner options for students and advertise through student organizations.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/30/2023

Monitor student involvement and activity through volunteer sign ups and opportunities.

Person Responsible: Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 5/20/2024