

St. Johns County School District

Freedom Crossing Academy 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

Freedom Crossing Academy

1365 SHETLAND DR, St Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-fca.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.

Falcons Take FLIGHT

Focus
Leadership
Imagination
Grit
Heart
Team

At FCA, our expectation is for all students to be focused on their learning, become leaders in our school, use their imagination and creativity in the classroom, demonstrate grit when tasks become challenging, have heart and demonstrate outstanding character, and work together as a team in our school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Breaking Barriers

It is our goal for our students, staff and school to 'break the barriers' that are holding us from the next step in our dreams and achievements. These could include such things as the fear to fail, misconceptions, a fixed mindset, self-esteem, etc.

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
Fonseca, Gina	Principal	Oversee master schedules, budgets, facilities and safety
Lime, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Lead LEA, MTSS/Rtl , Middle School
Duggan, Matthew	Assistant Principal	LEA, MTSS/Rtl , Grades 3-5
Hurst, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	LEA, MTSS/Rtl , Middle School
Haliko, Erin	Instructional Coach	Support new teachers , PLCs, MTSS/Rtl, New teacher cadre, Professional Learning
Sims, Savannah	Assistant Principal	LEA, MTSS/Rtl , Grades K-2
O'Shell, Lauren	Instructional Coach	Support new teachers , PLCs, MTSS/Rtl, New teacher cadre, Professional Learning

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

SAC Team Meetings, Monthly SAC District Accreditation Survey, Curriculum Chats.

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))

Weekly CORE Team Leadership Meetings, Team Leader Meetings, dedicated PLC meetings.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	13%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A
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	31	26	13	18	16	18	27	31	37	217
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	7	3	10	15	27	38	108
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	9	23	11	18	23	17	29	27	28	185
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	25	19	11	3	16	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	23	11	18	23	17	29	27	28	185

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	1	0	2	3	7	13	9	24	59

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	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
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	32	18	21	18	13	16	27	33	45	223
One or more suspensions	3	2	7	2	5	14	12	19	21	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	3	1	0	3	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	25	34	21	16	103
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.	2	2	4	5	6	25	34	21	16	115
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	4	15	3	11	10	14	14	72

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	32	18	21	18	13	16	27	33	45	223	
One or more suspensions	3	2	7	2	5	14	12	19	21	85	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	3	1	0	3	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	25	34	21	16	103	
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.	2	2	4	5	6	25	34	21	16	115	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	4	15	3	11	10	14	14	72	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	
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*	73	72	53	77	75	55	78		
ELA Learning Gains				60			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			49		
Math Achievement*	78	78	55	83	45	42	81		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				71			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			61		
Science Achievement*	74	74	52	70	81	54	70		
Social Studies Achievement*	100	79	68	96	71	59	95		
Middle School Acceleration	60	71	70	67	56	51	70		
Graduation Rate		82	74		73	50			
College and Career Acceleration		32	53		89	70			
ELP Progress	62	70	55	55	70	70			

* 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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	691
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	52			
HSP	68			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	77			
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	48			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	59			
HSP	67			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	62			

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	73			78			74	100	60			62
SWD	42			54			41		9		5	
ELL	49			71			55				5	62
AMI												
ASN	81			93			83		83		5	
BLK	56			59			64		30		4	
HSP	73			78			70		39		5	
MUL	71			73			67				4	
PAC												
WHT	73			79			75	100	61		6	
FRL	58			64			63		47		5	

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	60	52	83	71	60	70	96	67			55
SWD	40	46	41	52	53	42	27	85				
ELL	44	43	31	56	48	33	23					55
AMI												
ASN	89	70	40	95	82		85	100	85			
BLK	49	50	50	58	62	55	50	100				
HSP	74	54	53	82	68	51	66	94	60			64
MUL	77	66	47	79	68	39	63	93	58			
PAC												
WHT	77	60	52	83	71	65	71	95	65			
FRL	63	52	56	71	65	59	57	91	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	78	65	49	81	61	61	70	95	70			
SWD	41	46	41	47	48	46	35	60				
ELL	58			68								
AMI												
ASN	93	90		96	83		97	94	92			
BLK	61	60	64	58	60	58	43	90				
HSP	75	63	59	81	61	56	65	97	56			
MUL	77	75	60	80	68	73	84	100				
PAC												
WHT	78	62	43	81	58	60	69	95	66			
FRL	65	50	47	71	57	50	59	77				

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%
07	2023 - Spring	72%	69%	3%	47%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	72%	69%	3%	47%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	76%	1%	58%	19%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	70%	-5%	47%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	72%	1%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	77%	81%	-4%	54%	23%
07	2023 - Spring	84%	66%	18%	48%	36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	78%	3%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	79%	-4%	61%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	79%	81%	-2%	55%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	74%	6%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	71%	0%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	70%	6%	51%	25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	78%	19%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	67%	33%	48%	52%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	85%	15%	66%	34%

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.

Both ELL and SWD subgroups show the lowest overall performance. The SWD subgroup has the lowest achievement percentages, while the ELL subgroup shows the lowest gains.

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

K-2 students showed the greatest decline from PM1 to PM3. Factors that contributed include new students and initial staffings.

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.

Overall, the FCA did well in Math demonstrating an 82.7 % proficiency with the state demonstrating 52.5 %, a difference of 30.2 %. Math trends included strong PLC, increased tutoring and classroom support.

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

When looking at the ESSA FRL student data. ELA achievement went from 54 % to 63 % proficiency. Math went from 56% to 71%. Trends included strong PLC, increased tutoring and classroom support.

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

From the 22-23 EWS data one potential area of concern is attendance. 217 students were absent 10% or more days.

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

- 1) SWD
- 2) ELL
- 3) School Culture

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We are continuing to focus on Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) as identified as a critical need from a review of Rtl/MTSS behavior plans, the MTSS Core team, and a review of the PBIS checklist. An alignment of FCA's Capturing Kid's Hearts and District Character Counts Initiative will be fully integrated in the schools social and emotional learning curriculum. The school will continue to implement the PBIS Behavior Flow chart.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Freedom Crossing Academy will focus on lowering behavior incident rates within the school and increasing attendance. All teachers will be trained in PBIS, LiveSchool and Capturing Kids Hearts' implementation by providing training, we expect to see an increase in teacher use of the LiveSchool platform, which is FCA's method of tracking and communicating positive student behavior.

During the 23-24 school year, we have implemented supporting middle school students with leadership and character building. Each student has been assigned a house or team with a trusted adult. Students will develop these attributes while working directly with a trusted adult. The teams/houses will rotate as a group for the three years they are in middle school.

Monitoring:

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

The PBIS team meets monthly to analyze LiveSchool data use, monitor the status of growth on the PBIS checklist, and develop action plans based on progress.

The Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) Process Champions will conduct classroom visits on a monthly basis to observe the implementation of the CKH process and provide feedback to teachers.

The MTSS Core team will monitor early warning indicators specifically related to behavior and will develop plans to meet specific student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@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.)

PBIS is a vetted system to improve behavior. FCA has integrated Character Counts into the PBIS platform. Students will receive points through LiveSchool that they can use on various incentives both in the classroom and outside of the class.

Professional Development will be on going including the opportunity to visit classrooms where PBIS strategies and Capturing Kids' Hearts are modeled. Teachers will receive coaching on implementation strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing LiveSchool to track positive behavior at FCA promotes student and school success. Students feel rewarded for their positive efforts and adherence to school policies. The positive reward system also allows for group and whole-school incentives through FCA's "house-system" where students are grouped across grade-levels and work to earn points collectively that earn them group rewards.

Coaching and observations of model classrooms gives teachers the opportunity to see PBIS in action. This is a way for them to understand implementation beyond trainings.

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.

The PBIS team meets monthly to analyze LiveSchool data use, monitor the status of growth on the PBIS checklist, and develop action plans based on progress.

The Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) Process Champions will conduct classroom visits on a monthly basis to observe the implementation of the CKH process and provide feedback to teachers.

The MTSS Core team will monitor early warning indicators specifically related to behavior and will develop plans to meet specific student needs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly review of data

The PBIS team meets monthly to analyze LiveSchool data use, monitor the status of growth on the PBIS checklist, and develop action plans based on progress.

The Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) Process Champions will conduct classroom visits on a monthly basis to observe the implementation of the CKH process and provide feedback to teachers.

The MTSS Core team will monitor early warning indicators specifically related to behavior and will develop plans to meet specific student needs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly review of data

The PBIS team meets monthly to analyze LiveSchool data use, monitor the status of growth on the PBIS checklist, and develop action plans based on progress.

The Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) Process Champions will conduct classroom visits on a monthly basis to observe the implementation of the CKH process and provide feedback to teachers.

The MTSS Core team will monitor early warning indicators specifically related to behavior and will develop plans to meet specific student needs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly review of data

#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.

N/A

Measurable Outcome:

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

The learning gains of SWD will increase by 4%.

Monitoring:

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

Increased focus on accommodations, small group instruction and data collection

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@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.)

FCA has made a concerted effort to support intentional scheduling by inviting FIN to promote intentional scheduling, decrease the number of ESE students in classes to maximize supports across all grades k-8, and grouping students based on student need. Additionally, ESE teachers are increasing support within the classroom setting. FCA has incorporated a designated ESE administrator that will oversee all ESE supports and services throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the above are:

- Data-driven
- District and State supported
- Differentiated for all tiers of support

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.

Review of SWD grades, attendance, growth with Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible: Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Fall, Winter and Spring 23-24

Review of SWD grades, attendance, growth with Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible: Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Fall, Winter and Spring 23-24

Review of SWD grades, attendance, growth with Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible: Melissa Lime (melissa.lime@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Fall, Winter and Spring 23-24

#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.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are a foundational approach to providing support for all learners with a focus on the SWD and ELL subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall learning gains of our lowest 25% will increase by 4% in both ELA and Math.

Monitoring:

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

Utilizing data for STAR and Cambium Progress Monitoring in the fall, winter and spring will support interventions needed for improvement. Additionally, monitoring the results of district and PLC common formative and summative assessments will assist PLCs with utilizing best practices for student achievement.

Additionally, teachers will monitor students within their classes, and use data to build student learning groups across grade level, based on student need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Fonseca (gina.fonseca@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 will utilize common planning time to develop unit plans developed with goals and scales. Common Summative assessments will also be utilized to determine students' needs and build student support groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the above are:

- Data-driven
- District and State supported
- Differentiated for all tiers of support

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.

PLCs will meet weekly with a focus on the needs of the low 25% and sub groups.

Person Responsible: Lauren O'Shell (lauren.oshell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly check in throughout the 23-24 school year.

PLCs will meet weekly with a focus on the needs of the low 25% and sub groups.

Person Responsible: Lauren O'Shell (lauren.oshell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly check in throughout the 23-24 school year.

PLCs will meet weekly with a focus on the needs of the low 25% and sub groups.

Person Responsible: Lauren O'Shell (lauren.oshell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly check in throughout the 23-24 school year.