

St. Johns County School District

Liberty Pines 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	9
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

Liberty Pines Academy

10901 RUSSELL SAMPSON RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-lpa.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.

Liberty Pines Academy (LPA) is a place where everyone is respectful, responsible, ready to learn, and focused on creating positive relationships. LPA will provide a high-quality educational experience by continually building the instructional capacity of our teachers and developing meaningful relationships with our students, staff, and community. Students and staff will implement and use instructional strategies that foster critical thinking and problem solving through real-world learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Liberty Pines Academy is to ensure high levels of learning and expectations for all students and staff. Through our continuous collaborative effort, students will have character, knowledge, and skills essential to pursuing their goals and dreams successfully throughout their lives.

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
Hoessler, Donny	Principal	School Principal
McCool, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
	Assistant Principal	
Ashcroft, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Langowski, Krista	Instructional Coach	
Cox, Kelley	School Counselor	
Lowrie, Stephanie	SAC Member	SAC chair

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.

Continuous conversation through monthly SAC meetings, SAC survey results, staff survey results, curriculum chats, and report card conferences.

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))

Through the PLC process, student data will be monitored by grade level/content teams, administration, and ILC.

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	13%
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	29	26	15	10	12	18	19	22	23	174
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	9	2	9	13	29	11	80
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	4	7	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	28	17	23	21	104
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	4	11	28	17	23	21	104

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	1	0	2	1	6	8	15	11	45

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	2	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	10
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	4	10	7	7	7	12	15	21	92
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	3	6	9	8	12	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	10	16	15	11	70
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.	3	4	6	1	17	10	16	15	11	83

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	0	2	3	6	13	12	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	3	4	0	0	1	5	0	16
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	9	4	10	7	7	7	12	15	21	92
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	3	6	9	8	12	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	10	16	15	11	70
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.	3	4	6	1	17	10	16	15	11	83

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	0	2	3	6	13	12	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	3	4	0	0	1	5	0	16
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*	71	72	53	76	75	55	81		
ELA Learning Gains				57			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			58		
Math Achievement*	79	78	55	86	45	42	84		
Math Learning Gains				76			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			69		
Science Achievement*	76	74	52	76	81	54	76		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	79	68	92	71	59	91		
Middle School Acceleration	69	71	70	72	56	51	78		
Graduation Rate		82	74		73	50			
College and Career Acceleration		32	53		89	70			
ELP Progress	59	70	55	63	70	70	68		

* 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	713
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	44			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	72			
HSP	71			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	58			

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	65			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	56			
HSP	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%
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	63			

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	71			79			76	86	69			59
SWD	42			52			43		21		5	
ELL	55			67							3	59
AMI												
ASN	84			89			95		96		5	
BLK	73			76			67				3	
HSP	68			80			72		54		5	
MUL	63			78			73		55		4	
PAC												
WHT	71			78			75		68		5	
FRL	57			67			66		44		5	

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	76	57	46	86	76	69	76	92	72			63
SWD	39	39	37	57	63	56	52	68				
ELL	46	54	47	83	74	83	69					63
AMI												
ASN	93	77		99	91		90	94	95			

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
BLK	66	52	25	74	73	75	29					
HSP	65	50	43	79	73	74	67	83	46			58
MUL	82	60		86	71	58	79	94				
PAC												
WHT	76	56	48	87	75	67	78	93	72			
FRL	60	50	39	75	68	73	58	87	57			

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	71	58	84	75	69	76	91	78			68
SWD	48	49	40	57	65	58	49	65	55			
ELL	45	87	88	74	96	100	36					68
AMI												
ASN	94	84		99	90		87	100	86			
BLK	64	59	57	69	63	55	46	82				
HSP	68	63	56	80	77	72	63	88	64			65
MUL	87	81		75	66		81	92				
PAC												
WHT	82	72	57	85	74	70	79	92	80			
FRL	64	55	40	68	64	64	62					

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	71%	-4%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	47%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	70%	69%	1%	47%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	76%	-1%	58%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	70%	-3%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	72%	1%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	88%	81%	7%	54%	34%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	66%	7%	48%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	82%	78%	4%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	79%	-11%	61%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	88%	81%	7%	55%	33%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	74%	-7%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	69%	71%	-2%	44%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	70%	2%	51%	21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	78%	20%	50%	48%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	86%	14%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	85%	1%	66%	20%

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 overall ELA achievement data (70%) showed the lowest performance but was consistent with the district's average (71%) and above the state average (51%). Newer ELA state-wide standards and newer curriculum were contributing factors as well as intentional planning for the students based on their specific needs.

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

Math showed the greatest decline from the prior school year. New BEST math state standards and curriculum, inconsistency within the math department staffing, and lack of initial resources available.

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.

Although math showed to be our greatest decline as a school, it was still 23% above the state average. Biology scored 37% over the state average (63%) with 100% proficiency.

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

Biology showed an improvement to 100% of students displaying proficiency. Prerequisite coursework leading up to the Biology class has been consistent in preparing students for this course for the past few years.

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

The number of Level 1 achievement scores is an area of concern.

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

1. Focus on intentional planning, data analysis, and supporting student learning through the PLC process.
2. Provide Professional Learning opportunities for best instructional practices.
3. Use of supplemental funding throughout the school year to provide middle school content area teachers planning days to focus on student learning.
4. Continue with Wonderful Wednesday for elementary teachers to allow common planning time to analyze student performance data and plan for next steps instruction.

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.

Overall ELA achievement was 70%, which is 1% less than the district average.

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 the overall ELA achievement by at least 2%.

Monitoring:

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

Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as FAST Progress

Monitoring three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Krista Langowski (krista.langowski@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.)

PLC teams planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessment data, FAST data, teacher observation.

Use of the SAVVAS curriculum resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and FAST data.

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.

- 1. PLC monitoring of common formative and summative data
- 2. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small group instruction.
- 3. Hire Reading Endorsed teacher for IR middle school classes.

Person Responsible: Jessica McCool (jessica.mccool@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Overall Math achievement was 78%, which is on par with the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

LPA will increase the overall math achievement by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as FAST Progress

Monitoring three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Glennon (erin.glennon@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 use the PLC process to identify deficits in learning, using high yield instructional strategies in small group to reteach and remediate to achieve skill mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment and FAST data.

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.

1. PLC monitoring of common formative and summative data
2. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small group instruction.
3. Math tutors for middle school grades.

Person Responsible: Erin Glennon (erin.glennon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#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.

Although our SWD ELA achievement (41%) improved from the previous year's achievement (37%), this will continue to be an area of focus.

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 at least 2%.

Monitoring:

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

Use of common formative and summative assessments through the PLC process as well as FAST Progress Monitoring three times a year. We will also monitor the Foundations and Voyager ongoing assessments to document student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Veniard (amber.veniard@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.)

PLC teams planning, teacher lesson plans, common assessment data, FAST data, teacher observation. Use of the SAVVAS curriculum resources. Lesson plans and assessment data from Foundations and Voyagers programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLC minutes and teacher lesson plans will show intentional planning for student needs based on common assessment, Foundations and Voyager data, and FAST data.

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.

1. Determine the L25 group at each grade level and identify which of these students are ESE.
2. PLC monitoring of common formative and summative data.
3. Administration observations of instructional practices, including small groups instruction.
4. Have FIN help with scheduling of students and classes.

Person Responsible: Jessica McCool (jessica.mccool@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 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.

Due to the increase student enrollment, the social-emotional needs of students and staff are our focus. A positive school culture and environment, as well as a focus on creating positive relationships, reflects a supportive classroom where learning conditions meet the needs of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of students referred for mental health, truancy, discipline referrals, and academic concerns will be reviewed by MTSS, and appropriate action taken to address the needs. We will look for a reduction from month to month of the number of students we discuss at our CORE team meeting in the MTSS process.

Monitoring:

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

During the CORE team meeting in the MTSS process, we will monitor student referrals and update actions taken on a monthly basis. MTSS data will be used to monitor Tier I, II, and III interventions. The MTSS team will monitor mental health referrals, counseling, truancy, grade reports, and discipline referrals. The Early Warning System (EWS) Reports and MTSS database/notes will document progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Krista Langowski (krista.langowski@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.)

Character Counts lessons will be taught by classroom teachers with a focus each month on the character trait of that month. Counselors will continue their small group sessions to address specific groups of students needs. School-wide expectations for following the LPA Way (Learning is our focus, Positive relationships are what we value, Always respectful and responsible).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is a continued need to provide social-emotional lesson through Character Counts, which are essential to the emotional and academic success of our students.

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.

1. Tier 1 character lessons taught monthly in the classroom
2. MTSS monitoring of students referred for mental health, truancy, and poor grades
3. Mental Health referrals for screening

4. Implementing the LPA Way campus-wide
5. Increase recognition of our students through the PBIS core team.

Person Responsible: Rebekah Walton (rebekah.walton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024