

St. Johns County School District

Pacetti Bay Middle 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pacetti Bay Middle School

245 MEADOWLARK LN, St Augustine, FL 32092

www-pbm.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.

Pacetti Bay Middle School aims to inspire within all a passion for lifelong learning and a commitment to personal integrity and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pacetti Bay exists to provide a safe harbor for all to explore personal pathways to become contributing members of a diverse society.

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
Murphy, Jeanette	Principal	Develop and promote the vision, mission, and goals for the school. Acquire and supervise all faculty and staff aligned to the mission and vision of the school. Analyze academic and behavioral data to refine current practices to increase student and school achievement.
Howard-Condon, Renee	Assistant Principal	Develop and refine student services operation. Coordinate MTSS interventions and oversee the Access ESE program. Coordinate functions for students, parents, and community.
Baczynski, Michael	Assistant Principal	Leads ESE services. Oversees scheduling and registration processes and procedures. Provides oversight and analysis of school operations and safety.
Mendes, Rachelle	Instructional Coach	Focus on literacy instruction and coaching school-wide. Focus on observing and providing coaching and support to all teachers with a specific emphasis on teachers with 0-3 years of experience.
Manias, John	SAC Member	As a teacher and SAC Chair, promotes mission, vision, and culture of school and facilitates SAC processes and procedures.

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.

Each year staff, students, and SAC members take a survey on school operations, culture, academics and safety. The plan is then presented to stakeholders for feedback.

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 plan will be monitored and revised as needed after reviewing progress monitoring data.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	18%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	69	102	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	78	59	200	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	47	40	119	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	47	40	119	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	61	53	160	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	31	23	80	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	44	56	158	

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	0	0	62	70	65	197

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	8	19	15	42	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	76	100	229	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	68	72	194	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	18	52	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	18	52	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	63	50	169	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	33	38	121	
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	42	53	60	155

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	6	3	1	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	76	100	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	68	72	194
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	18	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	18	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	63	50	169
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	33	38	121
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	0	0	0	0	0	42	53	60	155

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	6	3	1	10
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*	73	71	49	69	67	50	72		
ELA Learning Gains				56			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			42		
Math Achievement*	81	79	56	77	37	36	78		
Math Learning Gains				68			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			56		
Science Achievement*	80	73	49	74	75	53	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	96	87	68	95	65	58	86		
Middle School Acceleration	67	68	73	68	51	49	69		
Graduation Rate					70	49			
College and Career Acceleration					90	70			
ELP Progress		49	40		71	76			

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	606
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	29	Yes	2	1
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	62			
HSP	69			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	65			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	63			
HSP	65			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	53			

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	73			81			80	96	67			
SWD	34			45			38		0		4	
ELL	67			67							2	
AMI												
ASN	90			100			94		87		4	
BLK	65			74			64		44		4	
HSP	68			75			71		63		4	
MUL	70			74			68		68		4	
PAC												
WHT	74			81			82	92	67		5	
FRL	59			69			70		61		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	69	56	41	77	68	58	74	95	68			
SWD	26	37	33	32	52	44	27	72	25			
ELL	35	63		41	44							
AMI												
ASN	85	65		85	74		76	92	88			
BLK	55	55	52	56	66	52	71	86	73			
HSP	66	55	33	71	70	55	73	92	67			
MUL	69	61	56	73	67	56	76	86	55			
PAC												
WHT	69	55	40	78	68	59	73	96	68			
FRL	46	48	31	55	55	43	52	86	58			

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	72	62	42	78	64	56	68	86	69			
SWD	29	41	34	34	47	46	24	54	21			
ELL	38	42		38	67							
AMI												
ASN	78	72	36	85	77		54	91	90			
BLK	60	55	40	67	50	55	67	93				
HSP	68	58	45	75	58	49	68	82	68			
MUL	66	63	35	73	68	53	53	83	77			
PAC												
WHT	73	62	43	79	65	58	70	87	67			
FRL	56	51	30	67	55	41	63	72	60			

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
07	2023 - Spring	67%	69%	-2%	47%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	69%	6%	47%	28%
06	2023 - Spring	73%	70%	3%	47%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	79%	81%	-2%	54%	25%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	48%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	86%	81%	5%	55%	31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	79%	71%	8%	44%	35%

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	*	86%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	85%	9%	66%	28%

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.

ELA Bottom 25% demonstrated the lowest performance. A contributing factor: missing a language arts teacher for a large portion of the year.

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

ELA learning gains demonstrated the greatest decline. Contributing factor: missing a language arts teacher for a large portion of the year.

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.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average was in math achievement. There was a 26-point difference between our school (79) and the state (53). Contributing factors include professional learning communities which allowed for consistency and teacher professional growth and after school tutoring.

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

Social studies demonstrated the most improvement. The team continued to follow district pacing guides and worked as a collaborate team as Professional Learning Communities reviewing data and adjusting instruction.

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

Potential area of concern are the 160 students in 6-8 that scored a level one in ELA.

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

ELA Achievement for Bottom 25

ELA Learning Gaines

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SWD were identified has having a federal percentage of points index of 39. Our goal is to increase by 2 points or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD students will increase the federal percentage of points index by two points or more by increasing math/ELA achievement and learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Will be monitored using the state progress monitoring tool three times a year, district assessments, and teacher assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@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.)

Intensive reading courses and after school tutoring using approved and evidence-based curriculum. Continuous and consistent support from our instructional literacy coach. Professional learning communities (PLC) focusing on evidence-based strategies and instruction and lesson study participation/ reflections.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence based strategies and curriculum have the research demonstrating higher student achievement. PLCs and lesson studies focus on teacher growth and reflection and also demonstrate growth in student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Quarterly lesson study professional development will take place for all faculty. Weekly PLC meetings will take place to review data, adjust instruction, and reteach.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Mendes (rachelle.mendes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLCs are monitored each week and lesson studies are monitored each quarter.

#2. 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.

Professional Learning Community is a district initiative for all schools and a proven high yield strategy.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD students will increase the federal percentage of points index by two points or more by increasing math/ELA achievement and learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Will be monitored using the state progress monitoring tool three times a year, district assessments, and teacher assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@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 communities (PLC) focusing on evidence based strategies and instruction and lesson study participation/reflections.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs and lesson studies focus on teacher growth and reflection and also demonstrate growth in student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC meetings will take place to review data, adjust instruction, and reteach.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLCs are monitored each week.

#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.

Based on PBIS data, it was determined that the faculty needed to engage and provide immediate positive reinforcement to the behaviors we want to see repeated.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase in rewarded positive behaviors (100 points per student) and a decrease in office referrals by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS Team will monitor data monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Howard-Condon (renee.howard-condon@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.)

At Pacetti we have a token reward system when students exhibit behaviors aligned to Character Counts pillars. Points are delivered by teachers, staff, or administrators. Students can utilize points in the school store, or perks such as outdoor lunch seating and several school sponsored events. Points are provided immediately have the positive behavior was seen. When given immediately, the reinforces behavior will increase.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is an identified need to increase student positive behavior based on office referrals.

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.

Teacher professional development during preplanning. Teachers also demonstrated to students how the program works. Conduct student expectations assemblies by grade level during the first few days of school.

Person Responsible: Renee Howard-Condon (renee.howard-condon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: These activities will take place by the first week of school.

#4. 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.

Based upon current school growth and teacher retirement, it is vital we implement a system of recruitment and retention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to retain 90% of our faculty.

Monitoring:

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

School principal will monitor monthly mentoring meetings and mentor/mentee relationships and needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@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.)

In reviewing district data, lack of support has been the main reason instructional staff have left the profession. As a result, we have two teachers that organize new teacher events and monthly meetings. Our instructional coach also has a key role in supporting our new teachers and providing specific professional development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

New teachers require support the first three years in the profession. Our goal is to offer a variety of support based on individual need.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Monthly Mentoring Meetings

Planned professional development.

PTSO planned events.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Activities will take place each month.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School improvement funding is reviewed each month with our stakeholders during school improvement meetings. Requests must be directly related to school improvement goals, focus, and activities.