

St. Johns County School District

Picolata Crossing 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Picolata Crossing Elementary School

2675 PACETTI RD, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-pce.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.

Picolata Crossing Elementary School will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be provided an exceptional education that leads to a well-rounded individual who demonstrates good character, leadership, and critical thinking.

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
Morgan, Brian	Principal	<p>The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Kolk, Ewa	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress serving as the Local Education Agent (LEA). In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically utilizing the PLC process. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Higgins, Shannon	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress serving as the Local Education Agent (LEA). In addition, serving as the testing coordinator, Mrs. Higgins works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically utilizing the PLC process. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Rudi, Cristin	Instructional Coach	<p>The ILC 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 the whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for students considered "at risk"; assists in the design</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team. The ILC plans and provides ongoing, job-embedded professional development to support our instructional staff.

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 SIP is shared with stakeholders and input is provided through preplanning to accomplish school goals. The leadership team, school staff, and SAC members are all able to provide feedback and suggestions to be used in the SIP. The school leadership team reflects on the school outcomes and reports at the end of the school year. Teachers and SAC members provide feedback through the SAC survey. Information from stakeholders is incorporated into the development of the SIP by the school principal.

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))

Critical portions of the SIP are embedded into the PLC process at Picolata Crossing Elementary. This ensures that what we do coincides with the purpose of closing achievement gaps. In particular monitoring of students with disabilities every PLC cycle and also including ESE and homeroom teachers in the PLC process keeps the focus on student learning.

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	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI

Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	29	19	11	10	9	15	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	24	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	11	35	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	9

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	2	2	2	10	12	24	0	0	0	52

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	11	11	10	9	10	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	19	23	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	4	5	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	11	11	10	9	10	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	19	23	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	3	4	5	0	0	0	12

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	66	70	53	72	74	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				65			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			28		
Math Achievement*	72	73	59	72	50	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				64			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			33		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	66	69	54	62	77	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	279
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	2	
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	76			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	82			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	67			
HSP	58			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	66			72			66					
SWD	36			46			15				4	
ELL	77			69							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	59			55							2	
HSP	73			79			70				4	
MUL	64			68							3	
PAC												
WHT	66			71			65				4	
FRL	55			64			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	72	65	48	72	64	40	62					
SWD	39	42	43	45	45	32	24					
ELL	82			82								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	77	57		68	64							
HSP	68	65	27	68	67	42	70					
MUL	73	60		87	70							
PAC												
WHT	72	65	52	71	62	34	61					
FRL	65	54	50	63	57	30	41					

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	69	54	28	65	40	33	70					
SWD	39	41	21	36	43	36	52					
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			30								
HSP	69			67			58					
MUL	72			61								
PAC												
WHT	71	57	29	67	43	40	73					
FRL	48	0		53	40		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	60%	71%	-11%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	76%	1%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	72%	1%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	78%	3%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	79%	0%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	74%	-12%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	70%	-5%	51%	14%

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.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance. The 5th grade reading performance was lower than the school average. This contributes to the science performance.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The 5th grade performance contributed to this.

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.

All school scores were above the state average.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement. PLC attention to student achievement in math contributed to this improvement.

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

Students with disabilities requires the most improvement.

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

Student with disabilities performance
Lowest quartile performance
Science achievement
ELA performance
Math performance

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Providing a positive school culture for all students where every teacher identifies students as "our" students. This provides support for every student including our students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase of 5% in proficiency achievement for SWD.

Monitoring:

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

Through PM data in PLC cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@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 use of instructional strategies based on the science of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Educational research and professional learning.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

Positive school culture for students with disabilities and lowest quartile students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The lowest quartile and students with disabilities will increase 5% from the previous school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of student performance with the use of PM data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@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.)

LexiCore 5 & Dreambox student resources with teacher feedback and small group interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Previous increase in student performance using student monitoring of progress and "Leveling-up."

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Every grade selected essential standards based on 5th grade critical science benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase in science performance of 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Through the use of common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@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.)

Student support based on the science of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Educational research to accomplish an overall increase in student performance.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

All student performance will be monitored through the PLC process. Students will be celebrated on the morning news, recognized in their classrooms for academic, behavior, and Character Counts. Students with disabilities in our lowest quartile are also being monitored in each PLC data review at every grade level. The team of ESE teachers providing support to our ESE students has changed with some additional new hires and the entire team is "All-In" participating and collaborating with grade level homeroom teachers throughout the

PLC process. In addition, the school is providing an after-school incentive for 4th and 5th grade students who meet this criteria based on interest and availability. The program includes a game room reward for their participation. The certified teacher who is leading the program meets with students to assist students with monitoring their individual progress, setting goals, and celebrating successes. Student progress and attendance are both contributing factors in the game room incentive option. Students will utilize the math and reading resources Dreambox and LexiCore5 with teacher lesson remediation as a part of the academic intervention activities.