

St. Johns County School District

Mill Creek Academy



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Kenneth Goodwin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2022

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	16%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (66%) 2020-21: (65%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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.

At Mill Creek we will inspire students to be lifelong learners with integrity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Learning Community of Mill Creek will ensure that ALL achieve their fullest potential through challenging, purposeful learning opportunities where life-long learning becomes a passion!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Goodwin, Kenneth	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>
Stackhouse, Stacy	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. 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. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Ottosen, Jacqueline	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. 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</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
<p>Loughran, Jill</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<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. 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. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
<p>Kelley, Crystal</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<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 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.</p>
<p>Sawruk, Samantha</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Testing Coordinator</p> <p>The testing coordinators organizes and facilitates all state-wide testing. In addition, the testing coordinator collects and analyzes state-wide and common formative assessment testing data. The testing coordinator works</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		with the leadership team and collaborative teams (PLCs) to analyze the data and identify strategic intervention and acceleration strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/15/2022, Kenneth Goodwin

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Number of teachers with a 2022 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

118

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,873

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

21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

31

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	160	191	212	193	194	187	221	202	228	0	0	0	0	1788
Attendance below 90 percent	25	24	10	13	10	13	33	32	38	0	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	6	4	9	40	36	46	0	0	0	0	148
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	15	14	20	33	38	0	0	0	0	140
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	7	15	30	21	17	0	0	0	0	115
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	25	20	15	14	20	33	38	0	0	0	0	167

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	8	2	3	1	19	26	33	0	0	0	0	95

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	19
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
Monday 8/15/2022

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	154	181	163	165	156	197	180	207	182	0	0	0	0	1585
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	7	9	1	19	15	14	27	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	6	16	13	20	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	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	2	22	11	17	22	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	0	9	0	8	9	19	0	0	0	0	47

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			3	6	8	3	5	4	0	7	3	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	154	181	163	165	156	197	180	207	182	0	0	0	0	1585
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	7	9	1	19	15	14	27	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	6	16	13	20	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	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	2	22	11	17	22	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	0	9	0	8	9	19	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	6	8	3	5	4	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	39
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%			70%			73%	84%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	55%			61%			70%	67%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%			44%			56%	61%	54%
Math Achievement	76%			74%			74%	88%	62%
Math Learning Gains	72%			63%			64%	71%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%			50%			48%	66%	52%
Science Achievement	72%			65%			73%	77%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	87%			80%				95%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	78%	-9%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	77%	1%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	76%	76%	0%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2022					
	2019	69%	74%	-5%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	75%	82%	-7%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	82%	-2%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	80%	-9%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2022					
	2019	61%	74%	-13%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2022					
	2019	100%	80%	20%	54%	46%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-100%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	73%	-1%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	31	35	32	43	51	43	30	61			
ELL	67			83							
ASN	81	68		92	88		71	100	75		
BLK	52	49	33	59	61	46	48	67			
HSP	73	60	53	77	75	57	84	94	52		
MUL	67	45	38	65	68	48	74		46		
WHT	69	55	47	76	71	59	73	85	66		
FRL	58	59	55	64	71	55	65	72	50		
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	36	40	41	35	25	40			
ASN	76	74		86	70		58	82	82		
BLK	53	61		46	41		54				
HSP	66	59	32	72	53	40	63	86	75		
MUL	70	48		78	81		53	88			
WHT	70	62	47	75	64	50	67	78	78		
FRL	64	52	47	58	59	40	60	75			
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	38	51	43	48	53	38	43				
ASN	86	88		91	81						
BLK	63	73		68	75						
HSP	73	73	40	71	68	58	76				
MUL	80	83		80	75		90				
WHT	72	68	58	73	61	46	70				
FRL	64	71	52	66	65	55	70				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
Total Components for the Federal Index	9

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
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	82
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	52
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	69
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	56
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 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	67
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	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our lowest 25th percentile learning gains and proficiency are below their peers. Our lowest 25th percentile is mostly comprised of ESE students. There is a similar trend with the ESE/SWD subgroup data.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students in the lowest 25th percentile and ESE/SWD subgroup consistently underperform when compared to their peers. These groups of students have the greatest need for improvement.

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

We must ensure our students receive a guaranteed and viable curriculum with appropriate supports in the least restrictive environment. We will review our inclusive practices, collaborative practices, and co-teaching strategies to ensure we are meeting the needs of our students who are struggling academically.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains for our 25th percentile improved by 2 points. Math learning gains for all students improved 9 points, Math learning gains for 25th percentile improved 6 points, and Science achievement improved 7 points.

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

Our teachers utilized targeted small group instruction in our math classes to strategically support our students. In addition, teacher teams collaboratively planned lessons for math based on identified essential standards and outcomes.

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

Teams will meet collaboratively to review student performance data during cycles of inquiry. Teams will incorporate acceleration strategies into their lessons to accelerate the learning of all 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.

Inclusion training, co-teaching training, acceleration strategies, Professional Learning Communities training, data analysis training, common formative and summative assessment training, B.E.S.T standards training, and training based on our newly adopted curricular resources.

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

We are creating a collaborative environment where teachers work in teams to review student performance data, develop strategic lesson plans, implement the lessons, evaluate the effectiveness of the lessons, refine lessons and re-implement to accelerate student learning. This culture will be how we operate this year as well as in the future to meet the needs of our students.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our learning gains for our bottom quartile in ELA are one of the lowest areas of performance. Grade-level teams will implement differentiated instructional strategies to meet the specific needs of students to accelerate their learning. Grade-level (collaborative teams) will plan and implement standards-based differentiated lessons planned, implement, and monitored through the PLC process.

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

MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in ELA by 4% to reach 50% as measured by the FAST this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 2% as measured by STAR this school year.

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

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), Progress Monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

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.

Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative planning - provide job-embedded professional development during team planning.

Person Responsible Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with support from our ILC and administrative team.

Person Responsible Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our learning gains for our bottom quartile in math are one of the lowest areas of performance. Grade-level teams will implement differentiated instructional strategies to meet the specific needs of students to accelerate their learning. Grade-level (collaborative teams) will plan and implement standards-based differentiated lessons planned, implement, and monitored through the PLC process.

Measurable Outcome:

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

MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in math by 5% to reach 61% as measured by the FSAT this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 2% as measured by STAR this school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), progress monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

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.

Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative planning - provide job-embedded professional development during team planning

Person Responsible

Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the ILC, Testing Coordinator, and administrative team.

Person Responsible Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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 critical need from the data reviewed. Students with disabilities is one of our lowest performing subgroups. The students in this subgroup are also in our bottom quartile for ELA and math.

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

Students with disabilities will reach 50% proficiency and learning gains in ELA and math as measured by the FAST this school year. Students with disabilities in K-2 will increase performance and gains by 2% measured by STAR.

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

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), progress monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

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.

Create time throughout the week for general education and ESE teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the ILC, Testing Coordinator, administrative team, and Achievement Coach.

Person Responsible Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. A consistent behavioral intervention program throughout the school and all grades is important to develop lifelong learners who make responsible choices.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. We will reduced behavioral incidents by 5% by the end of the 2022-23 SY.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Our PBIS team review monthly behavior data in eSP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Utilize PBIS and Character Counts as the foundational approach to behavioral interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. PBIS and Character Counts are research-based programs that have demonstrated over time to be effective with students.

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.

Ongoing PBIS training will be provided to committee members who will share the strategies with their colleagues.

Person Responsible Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Create consistent behavioral expectations throughout school and train teachers.

Person Responsible Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Meet monthly to review data. Make adjustments as needed. Review behavioral expectations at strategic points throughout the school year and conduct in-depth refreshers for students with behavioral challenges.

Person Responsible Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

School improvement is highly connected to teacher and leadership improvement. With a focus on instructional leadership, our team will be able to support our teachers and staff to better meet the needs of our students and accelerate their learning.

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

MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in ELA by 4% to reach 50% as measured by the FAST this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 2% as measured by STAR this school year.
 MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in math by 5% to reach 61% as measured by the FSAT this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 2% as measured by STAR this school year.
 Students with disabilities will reach 50% proficiency and learning gains in ELA and math as measured by the FAST this school year. Students with disabilities in K-2 will increase performance and gains by 2% measured by STAR.

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

Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), progress monitoring data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our instructional leadership team will actively engage in the Professional Learning Community process with our teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

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.

Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The instructional leadership team will participate in the PLCs with our teachers.

Person Responsible Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The instructional leadership team will analyze ongoing assessment data, observational data, and walkthrough data to make timely adjustments to better support our teachers.

Person Responsible Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Stakeholder input and communication is a priority at MCA. We gather their input formally and informally through surveys, conversations, emails, meetings, and committees (School Advisory Council - SAC, PTA).

Our SAC and Team Leaders review student data and all aspects of our school and develops our school improvement plan (SIP). Since we do not have end-of-year state performance data, we will review our most recent data and gather new data at the beginning of this year to refine our SIP to meet the needs of all students.

Through ongoing input and monitoring of school-wide data, the SAC and Team Leaders will offer recommendations and adjustments that need to be made to improve the quality of instruction.

In addition, our Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) Committee will meet to review ESE data and practices to make recommendations to ensure MCA provides an inclusive environment for students receiving ESE services.

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

BPIE Committee - Inclusive practices

SAC - Shared decision making, review school improvement plan

PTA - Connecting school and community, conducting events to support students and families

Team Leaders - Collaborate and shared decision making to ensure students receive the highest level of education.

PBIS Committee - shared decision making regarding school-wide positive behavioral program