

St. Johns County School District

Wards Creek Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
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	20

Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-wce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At WCES we ensure Achievement, Learning and Leadership for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To build and sustain a culture that provides a safe environment where all stakeholders collaborate to ensure growth and achievement for ALL.

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
Klein, Kevin	Principal	Support to teachers and staff, administrative operations of the school, staffing, instructional staff and administrative goal setting, observations and evaluations. All curriculum related information with the exception of textbooks, MTSS Team member.
Haynes, Julie	Assistant Principal	LEA, textbooks, discipline, transportation issues, safety coordinator, assist with evaluations, MTSS Team member.
Williams, Jill	Assistant Principal	LEA, textbooks, discipline, transportation issues, safety coordinator, assist with evaluations, MTSS Team member.
Hagan, Robie	Instructional Coach	Responsible for providing support to teachers. Facilitator of the MTSS team. Data and Testing support, Coaching and Professional Development, Lesson modeling, and Intervention review/training.

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.

During Pre-Planning week with teachers, there is a data presentation regarding the previous year's final state assessment. The leadership team then meets with the grade level chairs to discuss what went well and what will need improvement for the current school year. SMART goals are then created. The principal then shares an abbreviated version of the data presentation with SAC and PTO and reviews the SMART goals with them.

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))

After the first diagnostic, data is analyzed and grade level teams are provided with the results. The grade level bottom quartile is of emphasis to the teams to discuss in their PLC sessions. After the second diagnostic, along with the grade level diagnostic, each teacher analyzes the proficiency and growth report for each of their students. Every student who is not high proficiency, high growth is required to have a designed action plan to share with the students. The MTSS team continues to look at the bottom quartile and asks the grade level PLC teams what they are doing collectively as a team to provide the remediation those students need to close the gap. After the 3rd quarter report card, the MTSS team reviews report cards grades to determine which students are struggling with mastering the standard. The team then meets with the homeroom teacher if a trend is identified that the bottom quartile student is not making adequate progress. Together we discuss a plan to more intensive instruction prior to the state assessment.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	

DJJ Accountability Rating History	
--	--

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	26	21	19	10	16	25	0	0	0	117	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	22	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	22	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	24	

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	1	6	7	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	12	11	8	11	15	19	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	16	
	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	3	9	3	3	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
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	12	11	8	11	15	19	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	16	
	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	3	9	3	3	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
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*	66	70	53	73	74	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				64			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			43		
Math Achievement*	72	73	59	72	50	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				55			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			35		
Science Achievement*	61	69	54	62	77	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	268
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	43			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	68			
HSP	70			
MUL	62			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	66			
FRL	62			

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	80			
HSP	52			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	66			72			61					
SWD	37			46			36				4	
ELL	61			78							2	
AMI												
ASN	72			91							3	
BLK	64			71							2	
HSP	67			75			57				4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	71			59			57				3	
PAC												
WHT	65			70			61				4	
FRL	61			58			47				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	73	64	47	72	55	37	62					
SWD	34	45	27	42	35	26	15					
ELL	50			50								
AMI												
ASN	90			90								
BLK	80			80								
HSP	64	69	56	62	44	31	36					
MUL	81	50		68	50		60					
PAC												
WHT	73	63	44	74	58	41	69					
FRL	62	57	33	56	43	40	29					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	74	59	43	75	56	35	65					
SWD	41	31	38	48	40	33	40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	64	100		73	82		58					
MUL	70			70								
PAC												
WHT	76	56	33	75	51	27	65					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	65	48	40	63	48		48					

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	67%	71%	-4%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	76%	0%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	72%	-3%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	78%	3%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	79%	-5%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	74%	-5%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	70%	-9%	51%	10%

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 percentage of students level 3 and above in reading is significantly lower for the subgroup of students with disabilities were significantly lower in percentage of students level 3 and above in reading, math, and science.

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

Tremendous growth in school size and not knowing the present levels of performance in the students. We need to provide more rigorous formative assessments and to truly embrace the Professional Learning Community process.

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.

Fortunately, are data compared to the state average is at expectation. However, we still need to determine better methods to reach our bottom quartile and ESE students. Although "at-above proficiency" is acceptable, learning gains will be calculated this year for grades 3-5 and we need to have an intense focus on that.

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

Proficiency in Reading and Math. Last year we focused on effective learning communities. We only placed two items on the grade level plates: Essential standards and formative assessments. In the 2nd semester we developed an intentional planning map to be used that would provide more thought into planning ahead, identifying learning targets, critical content, misconceptions, and higher order thinking skills questioning (Bloom's Taxonomy) to increase the level of rigor to the essential standards.

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

The belief that more time in the classroom leads to better understanding is definitely holding true. It appears that those who are frequently absent or tardy are the ones that are appearing the on the EWS.

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

- 1) Intentional planning for relevance rigor.
- 2) Maximizing the strategies within the Marzano framework, especially in the element of helping students elaborate on content.
- 3) Homogenous grouping amongst the team for interventions.
- 4) Providing more support facilitation time for ESE students by decreasing the amount of pulling students out in a resource setting.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Beginning the 2021-2022 school year, the principal laid out a 3 year goal. The first year focused on relationships. Staff meetings consisted on teachers getting to know more about each other. With the incorporation of Capturing Kids Hearts strategies there was a tremendous emphasis on establish classroom culture through the development of a social contract. A dedicated 20-minute block was encouraged so that Character Counts lessons were incorporated in the daily routine. To even make this time more sacred in the second year, the recess schedule was changed so that grade levels would go together 40 minutes before lunch. This left a 20-minute period before lunch. This strategic idea was so that there would be no time for academics, and a true dedication to the "Family Time." Teachers are continuing to learn best practices that include, whole-brain teaching, love and logic, 7 habits of successful students, etc." The focus in the 2021-2022 school year was the PLC process is also strengthening relationships amongst the faculty. This year, in addition to the other year's goals of Relationships and Relevance, brings the addition of Rigor. With the efforts of the PLC process, the teachers have a better understanding of the standards. Now it's time to bring it all together and demand deeper evidence of learning.

The administration is working closely along with the PTO to have opportunities for families to join the school in events. Business partners also provide spirit nights.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase in the number of students at proficiency in Reading and Math on the end-of-year state assessment. In addition, increasing the number of students with high growth.

Monitoring:

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

The administration sets the tone of culture by being to recognize and respond to the current needs. There are intentional plans set in place to promote relationships and a positive learning environment. At pre-planning there are activities built in to have teachers interact with others. There are also learning initiatives in establishing the first two weeks of school as developing relationships with students for an understanding that they are a family. The PBIS expectations and Social Contract within the classroom is established and agreed upon. Throughout the first weeks of school, teachers also make positive phone calls to parents. Within the school day "family time" occurs on a daily basis to discuss expectations. Throughout the year, several team-building activities that take place to continue to promote getting to know others. The PTO and administration work closely over the summer to establish several after school activities to promote a school community.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@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.)

SAC survey to all stakeholders.

PBIS initiatives of positive behavior referrals

Decrease in behavior referrals for discipline

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Happy and well-behaved students leads to a positive community which will lead to more academic success

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.

SAC Survey

Person Responsible: Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Last quarter of the school year

#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.

With the rapid growth in student population, so has also the number of teachers hired. With grade levels having more teachers, teams must get to know each other and how to rely on each other for assistance. We must completely embrace the PLC concept.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teams will identify each quarter's essential standards in reading, math, and science to guarantee an understanding of the most important concepts.

Monitoring:

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

Frequent participation by administration in PLC meetings. More review of identified essential standards and lesson plans. Evidence of formative assessments being utilized.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Haynes (julie.haynes@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.)

Book study reviews of DuFour's work involving best practices in PLC development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's effect size of significant increase in student learning when teacher efficacy occurs.

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 3 - Promising 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 Survey

Person Responsible: Robie Hagan (robie.hagan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: After the end of the 1st semester and at the end of the school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

To close the achievement gap, students identified as having a disability in reading must make considerable learning gains in their quest to proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities in Reading will be at least 40%

Monitoring:

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

Frequent conversations with IEP case managers about the progress of students with disabilities. Review diagnostic information with them on a quarterly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Williams (jill.williams@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Students will receive daily reading support from a special education teachers. All teachers working with these students will use data to differentiate for their particular needs. Increase in Tier III MTSS focus within the homeroom teacher's classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are research-based strategies and are chose due to the research on effect sizes.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

FAST results for 4th and 5th grade.

Person Responsible: Jill Williams (jill.williams@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Upon receiving data from the state.

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)).

Additional funding from the district is not provided. We will continue to try to maximize learning opportunities utilizing the funds provided for all schools within the district. We did try to be creative and fund an extra ILC to focus on K-2 teachers helping students meet the district goal of being on grade level by 3rd grade. However, although enrollment is near 1,200 students, we were not able to trade in funding provide for classroom teachers to fund this as a "Teacher on Assignment." Depending on progress after the 2nd diagnostic, the school may use funds generated by the extended day program to pay for tutors or interventionists. We spent the majority of our ESSER funds to purchase a program, Dreambox, for math. However, will have little extra available for human contact with students.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No