

St. Johns County School District

St. Johns Virtual Franchise 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

St. Johns Virtual Franchise

2980 COLLINS AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

[no web address on file]

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.

Our mission is to ensure all students are provided a flexible, family-oriented, and rigorous education through online explorations that meet the personalized needs of today's diverse learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of SJVS is to be leaders in innovative teaching through online and blended learning programs that use best practices to promote academic excellence in a student-centered environment while serving the District of St. Johns County.

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
Erskine, Ryan	Principal	Lead Teacher Meeting Teacher observations (Elementary, Counselor) Office staff evals (operators, registrar) Support staff evals (interventionist) Monthly Payroll (Part-time teachers) Summer Payroll Parent Notices via Messenger SAC Meetings Character Counts Committee Budget Contracts Invoices Principal Meetings FLBOLD Board Member for Florida Emergency Operations Plan Oversee daily operations of SJVS
Dixon, Erin	Registrar	serves SJVS by registering and placing students. The registrar creates the master schedule. Serves as the district liaison for virtual and blended instruction as well as credit recovery. Monitors student progress and communicates with stakeholders.
McCullough, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - provides instructional support to teachers.
Nagel, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - provides instructional support to teachers.
Bozeman, Ryan	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - provides instructional support to teachers.

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.

SJVS works with our administration team and lead teachers to look at trends and means to improve the overall direction of the school. Input is garnered by coming together and looking at the data as one collective group and identifying our student data and formulating our path to success.

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))

SJVS is an evolving school that is unique in that our student population consists of students from kindergarten through grade 12. We will come together as a team and use the data available to formulate first a plan of success to close learning gaps and ensure that all students have the ability to see success. SJVS utilizes our teachers in such a manner that we must consistently and constantly look for ways to improve. With the new testing means seen in progress monitoring, we will be able to go into the year with a clear idea of students that are needing additional supports. We will then come together after each testing cycle throughout the year and will go over the data to identify trends not only in student scores, but also the standards that are being taught. We will effectively communicate with each teacher their scores and targeted areas. When appropriate, we will look to our MTSS team to identify, highlight and provide instructional learning support for students.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	2%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	2	2	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	14

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	2	2	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	8

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	81	74	52	92	74	56
ELA Learning Gains	68	64	52	66	60	51
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59	52	41	76	50	42
Math Achievement*	65	69	41	87	73	51
Math Learning Gains	64	59	48	61	58	48
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62	48	49	69	55	45
Science Achievement*	71	84	61	81	86	68
Social Studies Achievement*	76	85	68	97	88	73
Middle School Acceleration	68			29		
Graduation Rate	100			95		
College and Career Acceleration	54			43		
ELP Progress						

* 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	768
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	90
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	57			
HSP	63			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL				

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)

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	81	68	59	65	64	62	71	76	68	100	54	
SWD	37	60	50	45	67	58	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	91	93		92	63							
BLK	63			50								
HSP	78	64	54	61	63			60				
MUL	83	71		86	53							
PAC												
WHT	84	67	60	70	66	63	81	87	68	100	50	
FRL												

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	94	71	83	83	47	57	88	98	72	100	44	
SWD	88	67		81	25							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100	81		95	47							
BLK	91	76		84	38							
HSP	93	84		83	54		93					
MUL	96	77		70	42							
PAC												
WHT	95	68	78	83	47	56	88	98	71	100	41	
FRL												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	92	66	76	87	61	69	81	97	29	95	43	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	93	66	79	88	60		84	97	33	95	45	
FRL												

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
10	2023 - Spring	75%	73%	2%	50%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	71%	0%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	69%	1%	47%	23%
08	2023 - Spring	78%	69%	9%	47%	31%
09	2023 - Spring	82%	70%	12%	48%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	76%	12%	58%	30%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	70%	4%	47%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	72%	-16%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	81%	-14%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	83%	66%	17%	48%	35%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	78%	-11%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	79%	-29%	61%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	85%	81%	4%	55%	30%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	74%	-26%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	71%	-3%	44%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	70%	-9%	51%	10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	78%	-6%	50%	22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	67%	6%	48%	25%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	86%	5%	63%	28%

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	82%	2%	63%	21%

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.

Data components showing the lowest performance are most certainly in our elementary grades. Here we are seeing, especially starting in grade three, low overall learning gains in both ELA and Mathematics. We strongly believe that this is due to students making the move from a traditional learning setting in B&M, to learning from home. This is then impacting the students where they are in a mastery-based program, where they may not be fully remediating areas and from a simple grade perspective are thriving. Another factor would be the disconnect from peers and then coming in solely to be tested. We are seeing more and more of these students who may only know virtual schooling, coming into a testing environment and are uncomfortable being around peers and others.

The trend seems to be following the overall number of enrollments as our elementary program is decreasing, and parents seeing that a return to a typical B&M setting would help in closing the gaps for many students. The trend though is that we are now seeing the effect trickle into the middle school grades. The key is to be proactive and identify early any learning deficits and incorporating individual learning opportunities for students to close the gaps. This will be impacted using MTSS.

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

Our Algebra 1 learning saw the largest decline for our school. One of the contributing factors was the utilizing of a new instructor that openly admitted they struggled with learning the content and then instructing the students on the content.

Another contributing factor is that with being virtual, in 2021-2022, students and families refused to come

in and test. What we were seeing is that students and families that followed the rules came in and most were accelerated and high achieving students. In 2022-2023 all students were again regulated to come in to test in order to meet the requirements of the program and stay enrolled. This opened the door that all levels of students were to test and more accurately reflect where the students were in their academic learning stages.

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average would be grade 4 mathematics. Overall, we believe that some of the factors contributing to this would be the overall curriculum being utilized. We say this because the average percent of learning gains for all virtual programs in grade four is only 43%, as compared to the state average being 61%.

Another factor is the learning environment that we are seeing as a trend amongst our elementary, where students have been impacted by Covid-19 and forced to go into an at-home learning setting. Math is already a difficult subject and when the first experience or lasting one, is learning from home, we are seeing more and more low learning gains in the elementary grades.

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

Grade 7 saw the greatest learning gains from last year to this year. Sitting at 83% is a testament to teaching style and material. Our students led the virtual programs in this area and we contribute it to year two of effective teaching through the use of weekly live teaching times. Virtual is built on the flexibility aspect, where students that are successful are independent and capable of working on or ahead of pace. However, with the influx of enrollments, we had a new stage set with students and the need for additional assistance and guidance became evident. Each week, on top of teacher open office hours, we set aside specific times each week where a teacher is discussing the content for that week, reflecting on the previous week and then there to answer questions specific to the course. Those students that took advantage of this was especially evident in grade 7 and the utilizing of live time and then the recordings afterward.

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

N/A

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

1. Improve the mathematics learning gains
2. Improve the ELA learning gains
3. Utilize the MTSS system to identify early and often students that are in need of additional support

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

SJVS had an early shakeup last year that the staff never truly recovered from, loss of staff due to over projecting. Going into the year, we had a goal in mind to have positive interactions, and discussions with the entire staff. After losing a sizeable number of staff, there seemed to be a distrust and fear coming from teachers. With that the staff will work together to close the learning gaps and identify students needing additional supports. By having the staff work together as a team, we will see more of a contributing team/family aspect of the school return. In turn, students will feel supported by teachers and teacher supported by administration. In the end the overall culture and environment should start trending in a positive direction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our outcome is to increase the overall positive feelings and environment in the school. The goal is to retain our staff by making them be heard and working together.

Monitoring:

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

Observing via staff gatherings, student enrichment days (meet the teacher, we already heard from both staff and families how positive this year was) and simple communication from administration to staff and vice versa.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@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.)

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will participate in subject area and virtually aligned PLC's. This will include both SJVS teachers and virtual instructors from across the state of Florida. Building up a team first approach will be so inviting and impactful for our staff.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Leadership team will meet prior to the school year to discuss ways to increase staff morale and comradery.

2. Leadership will go over expectations during pre-planning with staff.
4. The leadership team will meet to discuss how to support teachers in need of improvement.

Person Responsible: Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily, weekly, monthly check-ins with the staff. Just keep an open line of communication and expectations with staff.

#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.

See even more students identified as ESE accessing their supports provided by ESE teachers,

Measurable Outcome:

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

All ESE students will access the supports provided by the ESE teachers.

Monitoring:

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

ESE teachers will monitor/submit attendance to LEA after each live ZOOM session. This will be observed using the ESE data logs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@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.)

ESE Data logs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By attending weekly support sessions with ESE services providers, we will see an increase in learning outcomes and self-advocacy by our students. This will then assist with closing the achievement gaps.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Identify students who are not accessing their ESE supports.
2. Call home to ensure students have the ESE schedule and check in with ESE teachers for communication success.
3. Monitor attendance throughout the school semester/year, while utilizing data logs.
4. Discuss possible alternative learning environments throughout the semester/year with students not attending regular sessions each week.

Person Responsible: Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly check ins and impacting students both at the semester and year end dates.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

Based on the data of having roughly 5% of students on an active RTI plan, we as a school have identified the need is just. We as a school will be more proactive in utilizing FAST data, course access, student resets, and pacing concerns to look for means to assist. This will be unique to virtual in how we look at students needing assistance, but if we work together as a team and identify struggling students early on, we can increase our MTSS program to better serve our families.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our outcome is to identify students that may need additional resources in order to see success.

Monitoring:

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

Data chats will occur and an increase in administrative involvement this year in MTSS meetings and discussions. Will look over data, pacing and student participation to see if tiered intervention is warranted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@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.)

Teachers and interventionists are working hand and hand to first identify students needing additional assistance and also looking at data for struggling students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will sit with administration to see targeted areas of concern and work with interventionist to assist struggling students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Data Chats
2. Student pacing check-ins
3. MTSS Process
4. Intervention by instructional staff
5. Data Chats

Person Responsible: Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of each testing cycle.