

St. Johns County School District

Palencia 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
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

Palencia Elementary School

355 PALENCIA VILLAGE DR, St. Augustine, FL 32095

<http://www-pes.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.

"We are a CREW setting SAIL into Tomorrow's world."

Included in this are the Key words CREW and SAIL, which stand for:

C- Creative S- Successful
R- Responsible A- Adventurous
E- Engaged I- Innovative
W - Worthy L- Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our School Vision is very simple: 100%

100% to us means that we strive to be a school where ALL (100%) of our students are achieving the required level of proficiency.

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
Goodrich, Catherine	Principal	At Palencia Elementary, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities, as well as participating on the Rtl team. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.
Cooper, Theresa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal at Palencia Elementary also provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities, and also participates on the Rtl team.
Johnson, Courtney	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal at Palencia Elementary also provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities, and also participates on the Rtl team.
Misch, Laurie	Instructional Coach	Palencia Elementary's Instructional Literacy Coach develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children.
Clark, Michael D	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Morphew, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Oester, Allison	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Huster, Sally	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Jackson, Jenny	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Simanoff, Michon	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Andreoni, Alison	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Klauk, Shanna	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Ledford, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hogan, Emily	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Suderman, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Flowers, Heather	Instructional Media	Media Specialist: The Media Specialist selects, classifies and circulates both print and non-print information. Additionally, they develop curriculum integration of information skills and multimedia applications, materials and equipment. They often provide suggestions and guidance to staff and students alike in developing a desire to read in our students.
Hernandez, Arlene	Teacher, ESE	The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.

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 involves the school leadership, team leaders, teachers, and SAC as stakeholders to gain input and develop ideas for our SIP.

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 Assistant Principal will check in regularly throughout the year to ensure our school is on track to work towards our SIP goals. If changes are required to our goals throughout the year the school leadership and stakeholders will meet to adjust the SIP.

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	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	15%
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) 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	14	11	13	8	10	0	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	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	

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	3	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	17
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	4	7	12	13	14	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	5	11	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	30	

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	1	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	13
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	13	4	7	12	13	14	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	5	11	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	30	

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	1	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	13
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*	76	70	53	82	74	56	80		
ELA Learning Gains				69			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			35		
Math Achievement*	81	73	59	81	50	50	82		
Math Learning Gains				62			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			36		
Science Achievement*	71	69	54	73	77	59	66		
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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
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	68

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	476
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	49			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	75			
HSP	75			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	73			

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	48			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	58			
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	90			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	60			

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			81			71					
SWD	45			54			35				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	70			100							2	
BLK	83			67							2	
HSP	82			68			75				3	
MUL	82			82							3	
PAC												
WHT	75			82			69				4	
FRL	78			72			55				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	82	69	60	81	62	49	73					
SWD	54	63	53	54	48	35	28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	74	45		90	75							

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	67		62	25							
HSP	85	79		79	61		65					
MUL	100			79								
PAC												
WHT	81	69	59	81	63	52	75					
FRL	72	63	71	59	56	44	54					

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	80	59	35	82	54	36	66					
SWD	53	31	25	52	38	26	33					
ELL	60			80								
AMI												
ASN	95			95								
BLK	65			71								
HSP	71	50		76	30		42					
MUL	83			83								
PAC												
WHT	81	59	45	83	59	40	70					
FRL	63	45		63	35		43					

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	76%	71%	5%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	76%	-4%	58%	14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	78%	72%	6%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	89%	78%	11%	59%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	79%	7%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	74%	4%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	70%	0%	51%	19%

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 area with the lowest performance in 22-23, based on Cambium and Star data which we believe to be most relevant when developing our schoolwide improvement plan, is our ELA achievement.

22-23 data (Cambium/FAST and Renaissance STAR)

-K-2 percentage of students at or above - PM 1 = 68% and PM 2 = 76%

-3 - 5 percentage of students earning a rating of 3 or higher - PM 1 = 45% and PM 2 = 75%

The percentage of students meeting expectations according to our two assessment systems is notably lower in ELA than in Math. While we understand that these assessment systems are new and have not yet established trend data, it is the most current information representing the majority of students who we will continue to serve in the 23-24 school year.

The 22-23 data was reviewed along with data from 2022 and 2019 FSA.

ELA Achievement

2022 - 82%

2019 - 81%

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

Consistent with the information above, the data component that showed the greatest decline was in the area of ELA. It is difficult to compare data year to year based on the fact that different forms of data have been provided and different assessment systems have been utilized. However, we are able to note that the achievement of the SWD and the lowest 25th percentile also indicate that we had fewer students meeting expectations in ELA in 2023 (49%) when compared to 2022 (54%) and 2019 (59%).

Overall, we are seeing more students coming into our school with greater needs in a variety of areas including academic areas and social or behavioral areas. Also, in recent years the student population has fluctuated at different grade levels requiring the need to shift general education and ESE staff to different positions, which may have an impact on the experience level of the staff providing direct instruction and ESE support in the area of ELA.

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 reviewing the 22-23 data, which most directly impacts current instruction and our current student population, we are unable to identify gaps when compared to the state or the district average.

Reading 3-5 (PM 3 achievement)

- State 49%
- District 71%
- Palencia 75%

Math 3-5 (PM 3 achievement)

- State 55%
- District 78%
- Palencia 84%

Reading 3-5 SWD (PM 3 Achievement)

- State - not available
- District - 36%
- Palencia 49%

Black 3-5 (PM 3 Achievement)

- State - not available
- District 49%
- Palencia 77%

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

When comparing PM 1 to PM 3 our greatest area of improvement was mathematics. Our school has implemented the BEST Standards and the district created common summative assessments that are aligned to the state standards. When it comes to planning instruction we are using the assessments to determine the instructional focus of lessons.

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

Although we have seen improvement in our absenteeism (63 students to 56 students), we would still like to reduce the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more.

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

1. ELA achievement - increase the % of students at a 3 or above on FAST or meeting the expected benchmarks with STAR Reading
2. ELA achievement of SWD population - increase the % of students meeting expectations on Star Reading, Star Early Literacy, or Cambium/FAST Reading. Current levels are below:
 - K-2 STAR Early Literacy PM 3 achievement 39%
 - K-2 STAR Reading PM 3 achievement 61%
 - 3-5 Cambium Reading PM 3 achievement 49%
3. Decrease retention rate
4. Decrease absenteeism

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Weekly, PLC teams meet for 60 minutes to solidify core instruction, develop common assessments, review data, and form remediation groups. Our core Rtl team meets weekly and routinely monitors growth of the school's lowest 25%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FAST reading outcomes will show 20% learning gains from PM1 to PM2 in the 2023-2024 school year, which is an increase from the learning gains demonstrated in 2022-2023 from PM1 to PM2 of 17%.

Monitoring:

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

Each grade level team as well as the schools guiding coalition will review and monitor data from classroom summatives and Common Summative Assessments provided by the school district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@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.)

Throughout the PLC process, grade level teams will identify and remediate students needing additional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improving teacher clarity through a PLC process has a greater effect size (.84) than other strategies and has shown to yield student growth.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Identify essential standards
2. Identify specific pre-requisite skills needed for essential standard acquisition
3. Remediate deficiencies (outside of core instruction time)
4. Teams and Rtl core team monitor progress monitoring data and report card grades
5. ESE teachers are included in all aforementioned steps.
6. Utilized Global PD resources to enhance teacher clarity.

Person Responsible: Theresa Cooper (theresa.cooper@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: February 1st, 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment 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.

Enhancing the culture and environment of our school is a priority. The goal is to increase the emphasis on the Character Counts! program within the school and to begin the process of establishing common schoolwide expectations for behavior that are aligned to the principles and practices of PBIS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome will come in the form of decreased referrals from the 22-23 to 23-24 school year. EWS data indicated a total of 15 OSS/ISS incidents in 22-23. The goal is to decrease the number of referrals and OSS/ISS related consequences by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

The SIP Team, comprised of SAC Co-chairs, school administrators and school counselor, will monitor the number of referrals on a monthly basis to determine grade levels or classrooms requiring additional support. We will also be able to identify specific locations within the building or behaviors that need to be addressed more specifically.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Character Counts! and PBIS programs have a long history of use in public school settings and are both based on research, providing us with an evidence based intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a collective team we have experienced the qualitative and quantitative impact of a robust Character Counts! Program and PBIS program. Many schools in the district have successfully integrated the two programs to create an environment with clear schoolwide expectations that promote the building of positive character traits.

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.

Staff developed schoolwide expectations (beginning of the school year – preplanning days)

Committee to develop a matrix for behavioral expectations that align to the schoolwide PBIS expectations for all areas of the building (first semester)

Continue monthly character trait certificates – students receive certificates, pencils, included in the Pirate Post, recognition on the morning news

Host two or three Character Counts! Assemblies to recognize award recipients and provide all students with access to motivational speakers from within the district who exemplify the Pillars of Character Counts!

Person Responsible: Carly Gordon (carly.gordon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Activities and opportunities to monitor the action steps occur throughout the year, but will be completed by the end of the school year.

#3. 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.

School leaders promote the establishment and ensure the success of PLC teams. Teachers on the grade level teams serve as the school leaders. This area will focus on taking action steps to achieve “sustaining” for the common school goals indicator according to the Professional Learning Communities at Work Continuum: Laying the Foundation rubric found in Learning by Doing.

“All staff members pursue measurable goals that are directly linked to the school’s goals as part of their routine responsibilities. Teams work interdependently to achieve common goals for which members are mutually accountable. ...”

Measurable Outcome:

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

Preassessment and post assessment of the indicator for Common School Goals on the PLC rubric. The goal is that each PLC team will improve by at least one rating on the rubric.

Monitoring:

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

PLC teams will complete a rubric at the beginning of the year, mid-year and end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Developing Collective Teacher Efficacy within the PLC yields increased student growth as supported by the research of John Hattie (see below).

Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effect size of $d=1.57$ Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to build collective teacher efficacy an effective PLC culture needs to be established and nurtured throughout the year. This begins with the refinement of PLC norms as roles based on information obtained at the PLC at Work Conference from the summer of 2023.

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.

Redefine roles and select roles based on personalities and comfort levels with the associated tasks

Engage in norm creation that focuses on generating norms based off of the behaviors that the team feels will “derail” the PLC or interrupt the process that directly impacts student learning and achievement.

Focus on the “Tight Elements in a PLC” (Learning by Doing, p. 14)

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Establishing roles and norms - August/September Evaluate PLC with rubric – beginning of the year, mid year, end of the year

#4. 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.

In PLC teams focus on individual progress of SWD as it related to our goal area of ELA using data collected from a variety of sources: Lexia, Cambium/FAST, STAR, and other progress monitoring data

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increased percentage of SWD students meeting expectations for ELA in PM3. We will work toward a goal of a 5-10 percentage point increase.

K-2 Early Literacy

22-23 PM 3 – 39%

23-24 PM 3 goal – 44% - 49%

K-2 Reading

22-23 PM 3 – 61%

23-24 PM 3 goal – 66% - 71%

3-5 Reading

22-23 PM 3 – 49%

23-24 PM 3 goal – 54% - 59%

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored primarily with the PM 1 – PM2 percentage change. Additional progress monitoring tools specifically in domains with relatively low scores in PM 1 of 23-24 or from PM 3 in 22-23 may be used to measure progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Foundations, Wilson, Just Words, LLI

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The content of each Wilson® program is based on reading research. Scientific evidence reveals that reading is the intersection of five critical components: phonemic awareness and phonics (also referred to as alphabetics), fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

While addressing the general student population, the science of reading also stipulates that these same foundational skills must be taught to students and adults with reading deficits (Kruidenier et al., 2010; Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009; NICHD, 2000). A lack of foundational skills is a major cause of poor performance in struggling readers. Word-level deficiencies limit an individual's exposure to text, which in turn impedes the person's vocabulary development and reading comprehension (Stanovich, 1986). To overcome these deficiencies, students and adults with reading deficits require direct, systematic instruction in the foundational skills of reading. The content of each Wilson program (Wilson Reading System®, Foundations®, and Just Words®) is based on this research.

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.

- Data disaggregation analysis and of 22-23 assessment data
- planning of instructional strategies to support improvement of SWD in identified domains within the ELA assessment

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Data review will occur within the first month of school. Data will be revisited after PM 1 and PM 2 administrations to look for trends & areas of relative strength/weakness.