

St. Johns County School District

Fruit Cove Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fruit Cove Middle School

3180 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Jacobson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2020-21: (69%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Fruit Cove Middle School is committed to building positive student-teacher relationships, focusing on high academic standards and developing the six pillars of character in all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fruit Cove Middle School will inspire in all students a passion for lifelong learning, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jacobson, Kelly	Principal	
Lynn, Erin	Assistant Principal	
Hilts, Adrienne	Assistant Principal	
Sisson, Lori	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/18/2021, Kelly Jacobson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,195

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	403	435	0	0	0	0	1225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	59	60	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	27	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	16	21	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	22	23	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	8	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	375	394	436	0	0	0	0	1205
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	29	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	375	394	436	0	0	0	0	1205
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	29	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%			78%	68%	54%	78%	69%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	65%			68%	59%	54%	64%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%			54%	48%	47%	48%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	78%			85%	77%	58%	88%	76%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%			70%	68%	57%	72%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%			56%	60%	51%	68%	58%	51%
Science Achievement	78%			79%	70%	51%	82%	73%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	93%			97%	88%	72%	96%	87%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	81%	74%	7%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	77%	72%	5%	52%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2021					
	2019	76%	71%	5%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	80%	74%	6%	55%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2021					
	2019	78%	78%	0%	46%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	78%	72%	6%	48%	30%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	90%	7%	71%	26%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	81%	17%	57%	41%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	32	38	32	38	34	34	42	72	20		
ELL	61	65	61	70	57	64	64				
ASN	93	85	79	93	68	64	90	97	90		
BLK	74	65	53	63	59	56	64	90	62		
HSP	64	56	37	71	56	46	61	83	63		
MUL	62	61	74	71	46	56	52	95	57		
WHT	77	63	47	80	56	49	84	94	78		
FRL	58	59	47	60	52	35	61	74	50		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	47	42	56	55	52	44	85	13		
ELL	36	67	69	67	63	64					
ASN	93	76	64	97	83		93	97	85		
BLK	69	84	71	65	63	45	50	88	54		
HSP	70	60	45	81	65	51	80	93	50		
MUL	61	53	69	76	58	50		94			
WHT	80	68	52	86	70	58	80	98	57		
FRL	60	62	51	69	53	50	68	86	29		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	40	35	57	54	53	36	81	14		
ELL	25	36	30	58	62						
ASN	91	82		99	87		100	100	90		
BLK	69	61	50	74	66	58	73	83	18		
HSP	71	60	41	84	66	61	73	94	56		
MUL	68	57	25	77	72	70	77		73		
WHT	79	63	49	88	72	68	84	97	56		
FRL	65	55	43	76	61	57	67	89	42		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	65
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA and achievement and ELA learning gains saw a slight decrease of 3%, ELA learning gains of students in lowest saw the greatest decline of 5%. The subgroup of SWD in ELA achievement saw no change, remaining at only 32%. However ELA learning gains in SWD, decreased 10%, from 42% to 32%. Math achievement experienced a decline 7% across the whole student population. Math learning gains decreased 13% from the data collection of FSA. In the SWD subgroup, math achievement went from 56% to 38%, a decrease of 18%. In the SWD subgroup, math learning gains dropped from 55% to 34%, a decrease of 22%. The trend is that students overall experiences a small decline in achievement, the greatest decline is seen in learning gains, especially in the SWD subgroup.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is learning gains in ELA and Math, more specifically in the SWD subgroup. Learning gains in the ELA category has been an average of 68% across the previous 4 years, and dropped to 65% the last year. Learning gains in the Math category has been an average of 74 the previous 4 years, and dropped to 57% the last year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

During the 20-21 school year students in need of face to face instruction were often quarantined or chose to distance learn, and did not have a setting appropriate for their learning needs. Math saw the greatest decline as it is the subject area which requires the most monitoring from teachers. Learning gaps were widened as students decreased in face to face instruction. Students below grade level in reading experienced extreme difficulties in online learning, which focuses heavily on reading for directions and instruction. The school will be supporting students in the SWD category by creating a school-wide focus on instructional strategies that are necessary in differentiating for the learning needs of ESE students. Math teachers will be holding structured and intentional after school tutoring programs to assist in closing the learning gap created by the end of the 2020 and 2020-2021 school years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Middle school acceleration went from 60% to 77%, an increase of 17%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The school pulled a report which showed each student on or above grade level on ELA and/or Math. Students who qualified were placed in at least one advanced course. Administrators contacted parents to determine the most appropriate placement. A focus was made, and continues to be made, to have all students who read on grade level in at least one advanced course.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Administration continues to focus on placing students reading on grade level in at least one advanced class. Meetings are scheduled with each parent to determine the strengths of the students, and the team determines what advanced course or courses would be appropriate. For instance, a student with a strength in history, may be placed in an advanced history course. Teachers differentiate advanced courses to include more rigorous standards based instruction. This may include more higher ordering thinking questioning, project based learning, higher level texts, etc. A teacher in each grade level and subject area is gifted certified and trained to specifically differentiate in their content area for gifted students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development for teachers will focus on differentiation to meet the needs of different subgroups of students. This will include deescalation techniques for students on behavior plans and SWD students. Also, instructional strategies do differentiate and chunk content for SWD students. Administrators and counselors are all trained in reading acceleration reports and analyzing data for students on how to determine appropriate placement in advanced courses. The goal is that all students reading on grade level are in at least one advanced course.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The administrative team, principal and assistant principals, have each taken a grade for focus on monitoring the SWD subgroup. Each administrator has a set team of support to assist in making sure SWD students are on track to make learning gains on the 2022 assessments. Aspects in the scope of monitoring include grades, behavior, and attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain on the 2022 ELA FSA. The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain from 17-18 to 18-19 was 6%, but we lost 5% from 18-19 to 20-21. We hope to gain back the 1% and move forward with more increases in the lowest 25% for ELA.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase to 50%.

Monitoring: iReady progress monitoring data will be monitored by reading teachers, ELA teachers, and the ILC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Reading classes have been differentiated based on state test score performance. Evidence-based interventions, such as scaffolding and explicit instruction are used with the the reading classes to meet individual needs of the struggling students. iReady assessments and ongoing formative assessments are used for progress monitoring. Administrators actively participate in grade level ELA CLT meetings where student data and performance on formative assessments are reviewed by the CLT.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolding instruction (Hattie Effect Size .82) helps teachers meet the individual needs of students. Our teachers, also, use several explicit teaching strategies (Hattie .57 effect size) such as small group instruction, technology, differentiated reading programs to meet the individual needs of their students. When teachers use frequent progress monitoring and adjust instruction, they are better able to determine student needs and make instructional adjustments to promote student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA and reading teachers will use iReady data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness. ELA and reading teachers will work together to provide focused small group instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Goal setting and incentive rewards will be created to motivate students to reach their reading goals.

Person Responsible Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

ELA and reading teachers will receive training on differentiation and high yield instructional strategies for ESE students.

Person Responsible Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain on the 2022 Math FSA. The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain on FSA Math dropped from 56% to 49%, this was a 7 point decline. Since 2015-2016 there has ben a 23 point decline in math learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains of the lowest 25% will reach 60%.

Monitoring: iReady will be used to track standard math students, which include all students in the lowest quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using formative assessment data to track student progress and collaborating on improvement strategies with the grade level math CLT.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The math team will focus their deliberate practice (Hattie .82 Effect Size) in the area of increasing student achievement through formative assessments and collaboration through the PLC process. Each grade level math CLT will focus on tracking their lowest performing students.

Action Steps to Implement

PD will focus on how to support SWD and differentiate instruction.

Person Responsible Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Math teachers will use iReady data and formative assessment data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness.

Person Responsible Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The math coach will meet weekly with each CLT to supprt standards based instruction in the classrooms.

Person Responsible Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

After school tutoring will focus on filling in widening learning gaps created by the lack of face to face instruction and small group instruction in the 20-21 school year. Tutoring will be lead for each grade level, and will focus on only lowest performing students.

Person Responsible Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Decrease the number of students suspended one or more times. When students are not in school they are missing instruction. The learning gaps increase when students are not present for instruction. The most significant learning gap is in learning gains with SWD.

Measurable Outcome: We will decrease the number of students suspended one or more times from 7% to 5%.

Monitoring: PBIS Rewards will be used to track negative behaviors and reward positive behaviors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collective teacher efficacy: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collective teacher efficacy: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. Collective efficacy has an effect size of $d+1.57$ and is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Focused positive mentorship of students struggling with behavior concerns

Person Responsible Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

School-wide PBIS implementation with a focus on promoting a positive school climate that encourages students to grow academically, socially, and emotionally.

Person Responsible Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Staff will make a collective effort to support the students with disabilities to promote meaningful relationships, increase engagement in instruction, and decrease behavior issues in classes. There is a 43 point gap between the ELA achievement of SWD students and entire student population, as well as a 25 point gap in math achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the learning gap from 43 points to 30 points in ELA achievement, and from 25 points to 15 points in Math achievement.

Monitoring: The SWD subgroup will be divided up amongst administrators. Administrators will partner with ESE case managers to track classroom grades, behavior data, and attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Supporting learners with special needs using a combination of supports and interventions. Use available evidence to identify where learners are in the learning progression, identify specific evidenced-based interventions, implement those interventions with fidelity, and continually monitor the impact of those interventions. Differentiation will be used in classrooms. This involves adjusting the content, the process of learning, and the way the learners demonstrate the learning, and the learning environment. This will include scaffolding learning and creating challenging goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The effect size of supporting learners with special needs is 0.80. The effect size of differentiation is 0.46. To increase the effectiveness of this strategy it will be coupled with scaffolding learning (0.58) and creating challenging goals (0.59).

Action Steps to Implement

Hold PD for teachers in small groups. PD will be given by district level specialists in ESE and MTSS.

Person Responsible: Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Divide ESE students into three grade level groups. Each group will be captained by an administrator to monitor support for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

All teacher growth plans focus on implementing evidence based instructional strategies in order to close the learning gap between SWD and general education students.

Person Responsible: Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

After school math program will focus on closing the learning gaps created by COVID, more evident in math learning gains scores than ELA.

Person Responsible: Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The Positive Behavior Intervention System is a nationally recognized program that is committed to addressing student behavior through the usage of effective systems, data, and practices. Through the usage of the program, schools can experience better social and academic outcomes, a reduction in office discipline referrals, and improvement in student behavior.

As part of FCMS' implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention System, we have established a clear Behavior Expectation Flight Plan that focuses on 3 of our 'Character Counts' pillars: Responsibility, Respect and Citizenship. For each Pillar, the Flight Plan outlines behaviors that are representative of (responsibility, respect, or citizenship) of all our stakeholders. The goal is to promote, encourage, and reward positive behaviors. The behaviors will be taught, reviewed, and highlighted with fidelity and are clearly and visually displayed throughout the school.

Some other important components to PBIS are behavior intervention plans (tracking behavior goals for individual students), collection of data for discipline referrals, and the Rewards feature that allows students to earn Pilot Points for demonstrating positive behavior expectations. Pilot Points can be used at the PBIS Store or for daily, weekly, monthly, or

quarterly celebrations.

We know that supporting students, faculty and staff engage in positive behavior will build a school community where everyone feels they belong, can succeed, learn, and grow.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

We have two deans who split the role of managing the PBIS system. They manage negative behaviors, and discipline, but also do training on de-escalation and how to form meaningful relationships with students. All staff members do monthly character chats with students. All staff members are trained in using the PBIS system and using positive behavior reinforcement to reward students.