

St. Johns County School District

Hickory 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	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

Hickory Creek Elementary School

235 HICKORY CREEK TRL, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-hce.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.

Hickory Creek Elementary School will inspire our students to become confident, motivated, creative, compassionate, responsible learners who persevere and accept new challenges with a heart of character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hickory Creek Elementary School will be a safe and engaging learning environment that seeks to balance the joys of childhood, the processes of creative exploration, and the unconditional love and acceptance of every child with the highest expectations of academic success. To that end, all children will develop a healthy self-image, a mind motivated to utilize the knowledge and skills acquired in order to critically and creatively solve problems and communicate effectively. Our children will be prepared to be successful at the next academic level with a heart of character that is moved to acts of respect, compassion, social and civic responsibilities. Accomplishing this vision for every child involves a faculty committed to sharpening their skills and practicing their craft at the highest levels, frequent and embedded collaboration with colleagues and parents, regular parental involvement that allows school and home to be mutually supportive and responsible for the overall development of each child with a community that responds eagerly when given multiple opportunities to support excellence.

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
Cubero-Gonzalez, Yvette	Principal	School Budget, School-level hiring, Building Operations, Emergency Operations/School Safety, Schedules, Data Collection and Disaggregation, SAC/PTO Admin Representative, Staff Observations and Evaluations, MTSS Team Member, Community Partnerships, Intern Placement, Professional Learning
Gary-Donovan, Donna	Assistant Principal	LEA, Discipline, Bullying Reports, Threat Assessment Team Member, MTSS Team Member, Bus Contact, Teacher Evaluations, Textbooks, Summer Reading Program Contact, Duty Schedules, Assist in School-Level Hiring
Lo, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	LEA, Discipline, Bullying Reports, Threat Assessment Team Member, MTSS Team Member, Car Line Contact, Teacher Evaluations, Textbooks, Duty Schedules, Assist in School-Level Hiring
Kenyon, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Teacher Coaching/Mentoring, Professional Learning, Grade Level PLC, MTSS Team Member/Facilitator,
Yar, Lara	School Counselor	MTSS Team Member, 504 Plans, Classroom Guidance Lessons, Mental Health/Wellness Contact, Character Counts! Contact, Bullying Reports, Threat Assessment Team Member, WIDA/ESOL Testing, Community Outreach, Hickory's Heart Contact
Ferro, Jillian	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Fourth Grade Team Leader, Fourth Grade Teacher, Teacher Cadre Lead, Yearbook Sponsor, Performance Matters Contact

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team involves teachers, staff, families and community partners when discussing and creating school improvement goals. Feedback is obtained via our Needs Assessment surveys and our School Advisory Council.

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))

To ensure continuous improvement, the school leadership team will monitor the progress of the school improvement plan via classroom observations, and data discussions at grade level PLC. In addition, the

MTSS Core Team will monitor Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction. The MTSS Core Team meets weekly.

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	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	11%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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	14	17	4	7	12	11	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	23	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	23	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	1	3	9	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	12	7	11	6	5	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	0	6	1	5	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	12	7	11	6	5	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	0	6	1	5	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	76	70	53	77	74	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				63			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			65		
Math Achievement*	75	73	59	82	50	50	85		
Math Learning Gains				73			83		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			89		
Science Achievement*	71	69	54	77	77	59	88		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

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	483
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	46			
HSP	69			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	57			

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	49			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK				
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	63			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	57			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	76			75			71					
SWD	43			38			37				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	85			90			100				3	
BLK	55			36							2	
HSP	75			68			63				4	
MUL	77			77							3	
PAC												
WHT	77			77			72				4	
FRL	64			55			38				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	77	63	46	82	73	65	77					
SWD	50	45	33	57	59	49	50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	80			90								

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												
HSP	78	73		70	68		83					
MUL	67	50		74	56		67					
PAC												
WHT	78	62	41	84	75	65	78					
FRL	46	59	53	57	66	57	61					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	81	71	65	85	83	89	88					
SWD	47	33	17	63	77	77	57					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	75			83								
BLK												
HSP	81	80		81	90		80					
MUL	71			81								
PAC												
WHT	82	70	64	86	83	88	88					
FRL	66	73		74	91		73					

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	79%	71%	8%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	76%	5%	58%	23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	72%	0%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	*	66%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	80%	78%	2%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	79%	-9%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	74%	8%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	70%	1%	51%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to the 21-22 FSA data, our students within the bottom quartile are not making sufficient learning gains. Our students with disability (SWD subgroup) population are also not making sufficient learning gains. This trend is true for ELA and Math.

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

According to 21-22 FSA data the components that showed the greatest decline were: ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%, Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%, Science Achievement, and the Math Achievement of our students with disability. Some contributing factors: novice PLC cohorts, inconsistent staffing, change in student population (increase of students with IEP plans, interventions, transient families, and students from other states that had not received direct instruction or intervention within the year), and inconsistent student attendance.

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.

When compared to the state, 21-22 FSA data shows that Hickory Creek Elementary scored above the state average in proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science:

State Proficiency: ELA (55), Math (57), Science (48)

HCE Proficiency: ELA (77), Math (82), Science (77)

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

This school year our state implemented a new statewide assessment (Cambium) for grades 3-5. According to the 22-23 Cambium data, our ELA proficiency improved by 4% and Math proficiency improved by 6% when compared to proficiency in the 21-22 school year (please note the FSA assessment and the Cambium assessment are different assessment tools; comparison data may not correlate).

Action steps that HCE took in the 22-23 school year: Master schedule was created with explicit time for Wilson Foundations, NEST time (intervention), and PLC time for teachers. Professional learning focused on PLC and collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers. Focus on curriculum maps, standards focused instruction, and implementation of approved curriculum.

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

Attendance is an area of concern. During our MTSS Core Team meetings, we discuss student attendance patterns and identify students that are truant. Truancy letters go out to families. Another area of concern is our fifth-grade students. A little over 5% of our students in fifth grade received a failing grade in ELA or Math.

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

1. Continue to increase ELA and Math proficiency
2. Continue to increase proficiency in the SWD subgroup in ELA and Math
3. Increase Science proficiency
4. Improve student attendance
5. Retain our instructional staff (data shows that we improved this goal; retained 98% of our instructional staff in the 22-23 school year)

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

According to the 21-22 FSA data, our bottom quartile group is not proficient in the areas of ELA and Math. PLC is a continuous process that focuses on standards-based instruction, common assessments, data disaggregation, and intervention or extension of instruction as needed. ESE teachers sit with grade level PLCs to discuss students with disabilities specifically.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Grade level PLC will meet weekly in order to monitor student data and discuss intervention and extension opportunities for all students.

Monitoring:

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

School Leadership Team will attend grade level PLC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yvette Cubero-Gonzalez (yvette.cubero-gonzalez@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 is researched based and follows the continuous improvement cycle. Teachers will plan, assess, review data, intervene or extend learning, and then reflect and repeat the process. Text and resource material from Learning By Doing (DuFour) will be used.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working through the PLC process yields high levels of teacher efficacy and ensures high levels of learning for all students. Implementing and using research-based instruction and intervention, with fidelity, yields common language and common methods of instruction and assessment.

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.

PLC time added to Master Schedule. Teachers will meet weekly for about 45 minutes. Teachers will also meet every three weeks (WOW Wednesday) to review data and plan for intervention and acceleration.

Person Responsible: Yvette Cubero-Gonzalez (yvette.cubero-gonzalez@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, throughout the 23-24 school year.

School leadership team will attend all WOW Wednesdays. Principal will attend all meetings and Assistant Principals will attend their corresponding grade levels.

Person Responsible: Yvette Cubero-Gonzalez (yvette.cubero-gonzalez@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, throughout the 23-24 school year.

#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.

Based on 21-22 FSA data, our students with disabilities subgroup is not proficient in the areas of ELA (50%) and Math (57%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on progress monitoring, students with disabilities will increase proficiency by 10% in ELA and by 3% in Math.

Monitoring:

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

Students within this subgroup will be monitored throughout the school year. Grade level PLCs will complete item analysis of formative and summative assessments to target specific standards for re-teaching opportunities for students. PLCs will also review Cambium Progress Monitoring data for grade level proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yvette Cubero-Gonzalez (yvette.cubero-gonzalez@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.)

The school will continue to use the PLC process to share student data, plan for intervention and plan for common assessments in order to progress monitor students. The MTSS team will work with teachers to identify targeted research-based intervention for specific student needs. K-2 will use, with fidelity, Wilson Foundations for phonics instruction. Just Words and/or Wilson Foundations will be used as phonics intervention for students in grades 3-5. K-5 will use myView Literacy (SAVVAS) and its intervention components. In addition, the following research-based instructional material will be used for supplemental material for MTSS and ESE plans: Wilson Foundations (K-3), Wilson, Rewards (4th and 5th), Heggerty (PK-1), Just Words (4-5). K-5 will use SAVVAS envision for Math instruction. K-5 will use the Math Diagnosis and Intervention System (MDIS) for math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working through the PLC process yields high levels of teacher efficacy and ensures high levels of learning for all students. Implementing and using research-based instruction and intervention, with fidelity, yields common language and common methods of instruction and assessment.

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.

PLC time included in Master Schedule. Teachers meet within the school day.

Person Responsible: Yvette Cubero-Gonzalez (yvette.cubero-gonzalez@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Progress Monitoring data review and discussion (K-2: Renaissance; 3-5: Cambium).

Renaissance: Rachel Kenyon/Cambium: Lara Yar

Person Responsible: Rachel Kenyon (rachel.kenyon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Data reviewed at the end of each testing window. Approx. time frames: K-2 Renaissance PM1: late August/early September PM2: December/early January PM3: May 3-5 Cambium PM1: Early/Mid September PM2: December/early January PM3: May

ESE team will attend PLC and monthly meetings with administration and the ESE coach.

Person Responsible: Donna Gary-Donovan (donna.gary-donovan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly throughout the 23-24 school year.

#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 school data (teacher incident reports, office discipline referrals, in school suspension, and out of school suspension) HCE saw an increase in behavior needs school wide, specifically in the primary grade levels. In addition to Tier 1 behavior needs, HCE is adding 2 behavior classes in the 23-24 school year that will focus on Tier 3 behavior needs. Common expectations, common vocabulary, common reward system/incentives will be the focus of the school wide behavior system. HCE created a behavior committee to review current data and behavior trends and create a system for the school to follow. The team will work with our behavior specialist and mental health counselor to continue school wide implementations of a positive behavior system.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Staff will use the schoolwide behavior system with 100% fidelity. As a result, HCE will see a decrease in teacher incident reports, office discipline referrals (ODR), in school suspension (ISS), and out of school suspension (OSS).

Monitoring:

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

MTSS Core Team will monitor school data. The team will specifically review incident reports, ODR, ISS, and OSS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donna Gary-Donovan (donna.gary-donovan@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.)

Staff will participate in professional development on early release Wednesdays and during PLC (if needed). The resource used for the PD is researched based: Happy Class (Totem). In addition, our school counselor will provide research-based curriculum specific to grade levels and students needs. Character Counts! mini lessons specific to the pillar of the month will also be shared with the staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Schoolwide language for behavior expectations makes it clear for staff and students to follow. Character Counts! promotes good character. Providing face to face time with our school counselor gives all students a point of contact to turn to when experiencing overwhelming feelings.

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.

Meet monthly with the school behavior committee to focus on creating a positive learning environment for all staff and students. Team will also focus on progress and make data supported enhancements to the positive behavior system.

Person Responsible: Yvette Cubero-Gonzalez (yvette.cubero-gonzalez@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly meetings. Ongoing throughout the school year.

Provide opportunities for student interaction, engagement, and collaboration in the learning setting.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Lo (tiffany.lo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Provide professional learning opportunities focused on building capacity to implement resiliency lessons and activities to the instructional day.

Person Responsible: Donna Gary-Donovan (donna.gary-donovan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.