

St. Johns County School District

Creekside High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Creekside High School

100 KNIGHTS LN, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Creekside High School is to provide students with an opportunity to achieve academic, athletic, fine arts and extra-curricular excellence, within a safe and secure learning environment. Creekside High School staff and students will strive to model and support the six pillars of character counts. The six pillars of character are Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring and Citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Creekside High School is to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCormick, Steve	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all campus activities.
Mackoul, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Creekside high school.
Beck, Wayne	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Creekside high school.
Mander, Abbey	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Creekside high school.
Bundshuh, Heather	Dean	The Dean promotes positive behavior expectations throughout the school and administers student discipline consequences in accordance with the district's disciplinary policy.
Adams, Jill	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is a highly qualified educator who is knowledgeable about curriculum and instruction and is able to increase student learning by fostering instructional excellence throughout the building. The coach will engage in the delivery of professional development, including observing teachers, coaching and modeling instructional and assessment strategies, and providing feedback that ensures effective instruction and student learning.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link.

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site. We also work with our SAC and use the student, parent, and staff survey to help identify our needs and create goals.

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 administration team will monitor the SIP plan each quarter and review the data for each goal. If necessary, we will meet as a team to adjust our goals or action steps.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	5%
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	394
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	186
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	63
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	0	0	1	1	204

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17
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									1	1
One or more suspensions									1	1
Course failure in ELA									1	1
Course failure in Math									0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									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									1	1

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	78	71	50	80	74	51	82		
ELA Learning Gains				67			73		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			63		
Math Achievement*	78	61	38	79	50	38	77		
Math Learning Gains				70			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			44		
Science Achievement*	94	86	64	92	70	40	92		
Social Studies Achievement*	89	82	66	91	59	48	87		
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate	96	94	89	98	84	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	67	64	65	69	86	67	72		
ELP Progress	70	51	45	40					

* 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	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73

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	801
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	98

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	58			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	78			
HSP	79			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	77			

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	54			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	71			
HSP	74			

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	77			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	69			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	78			78			94	89		96	67	70
SWD	42			52			74	68		21	6	
ELL	59			62			85			20	6	70
AMI												
ASN	87			83			100	96		83	6	
BLK	71			66			82	96		53	6	
HSP	73			73			94	83		59	6	
MUL	77			74			91	84		57	6	
PAC												
WHT	78			80			94	90		68	6	
FRL	66			69			86	88		59	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	80	67	59	79	70	56	92	91		98	69	40
SWD	38	49	46	49	56	44	66	75		93	27	
ELL	55	57	45	59	53							40
AMI												
ASN	89	74	67	82	61		95	95		100	81	

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	77	73	69	74	63	30	93	84		97	50	
HSP	74	69	57	72	69	58	86	84		96	71	
MUL	73	55	61	81	84	70	93	82		100	67	
PAC												
WHT	81	66	58	80	71	57	92	92		98	70	
FRL	60	60	54	79	67	55	81	90		82	64	

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	82	73	63	77	48	44	92	87		99	72	
SWD	44	55	45	53	47	38	72	58		96	24	
ELL	53	85	80	42	27					100	55	
AMI												
ASN	87	74	45	71	47		95	89		100	96	
BLK	80	65	45	65	41		87	83		100	67	
HSP	79	75	70	69	44	38	94	82		100	65	
MUL	86	80	80	78	60		96	83		100	58	
PAC												
WHT	82	73	63	79	48	45	91	89		99	73	
FRL	72	72	42	70	54		88	67		97	54	

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
10	2023 - Spring	81%	73%	8%	50%	31%
09	2023 - Spring	76%	70%	6%	48%	28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	78%	4%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	67%	12%	48%	31%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	86%	9%	63%	32%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	82%	8%	63%	27%

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.

SWD was our lowest performance for the 22-23 school year at 44% at a level 3 or above. We are trending upward growth for our SWD. We are going to continue to monitor our SWD with systemic interventions.

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

The greatest decline is our ELA learning gains. Two factors that contributed to this are COVID and new ELA and ESE teams.

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 component is our African American students in math learning gains for the lowest 25%. Acceleration at our school is high, which can challenge students and create a perceived deficiency.

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

From PM1 to PM3, 9th and 10th grade reading grew by 20%. Our school provided professional learning for our 9th and 10th grade English team. Emphasis was also placed on vocabulary and morphology in the English classes.

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

Students with disabilities & our African American population is still an area of potential concern.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Lowest 25% learning gains
3. Student Character

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 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.

Data shows that a positive culture and environment in a school provides students with a sense of belonging, and a high student success rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student referrals for cell phones and tardies will decrease by at least 5% for the 23-24 school year and we will see a higher number of students earning character count cards.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly data will be pulled by the deans to see the number of referrals written for cell phones or tardies and character count cards will be counted monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Students will be given coupons from teachers or staff members when they recognize a character count trait. Students can come to the character counts cart on Wednesdays to receive soda or candy from the cart.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Promoting good character and student engagement will help students feel more connected to their school and peers.

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.

Teachers and staff will be given character count cards to give out and we will purchase items for the candy cart.

Person Responsible: Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: We will monitor this quarterly.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our area of focus will be our students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will move from 44% level 3 or above to 50% 3 or above.

Monitoring:

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

Students who score a level 2 or lower will be identified by the MTSS team with targeted interventions. Our reading leadership team will provide specific professional development, for our support facilitated teachers and general education teachers. We will also continue interventions from the 22-23 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Abbey Mander (abbey.mander@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.)

Team collaboration using the PLC model to include the ESE support teachers and data chats. A reading interventionist and an additional VE teacher have been added to staff for the 9th grade English team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teams that operate via the PLC model build lessons that align with essential standards, review student data, and increase 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.

ELA teams along with the ESE support teachers will analyze assessment data as it aligns to the standards and drive their instruction based on the results. Specific attention will be given to our SWD population as it compares to other student groups.

Person Responsible: Abbey Mander (abbey.mander@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Data will be looked at after each FAST assessment given.

#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.

One area of focus will be teacher retention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to retain 100% of all teachers.

Monitoring:

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

Climate surveys, new teacher cadre support, PLC teams, and on going coaching conversations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Cadre meetings, PLCs, and district trainings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When you retain teachers, you create community and a positive culture. This helps with student learning and building relationships.

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.

Coaching cycles, PLC meetings, new teacher cadre meetings.

Person Responsible: Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of first quarter.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Our need for student engagement was determined based on our faculty survey. This has been a focus since COVID.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We should see less discipline and higher attendance. We also should see an increase in student engagement and attendance.

Monitoring:

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

Behavior attendance data, MTSS team, discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Evidence shows that student engagement is directly related to student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The faculty identified this area in a survey sent out.

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.

Professional learning will be delivered to teachers on engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Steve McCormick (steve.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 1st quarter. Quarterly updates.