
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 Classical Academy

114 CANOVA RD, Fleming Island, FL 32003

www.stjca.org

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.

The mission of St. Johns Classical Academy is to develop graduates in mind and character through a classical, content-rich curriculum that emphasizes the principles of virtuous living, traditional learning, and civic responsibility. We are building intelligent, virtuous American citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of St. Johns Classical Academy is to offer a unique option that provides students with classical education. Scholars will receive a cohesive Classical education, which builds upon itself year after year, creating a successful foundation for learning. Scholars will be intentionally taught the benefits of a virtuous character and will be challenged through the lessons taught within the curriculum to develop and strengthen their character. Our teachers will provide the support and attention scholars require in order to meet the high expectations of a Classical education.

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
Johnson, Daniel	Principal	<p>The School Headmaster is tasked with overall school management to fulfill the mission, providing organizational and instructional leadership to assure positive scholar outcomes while maintaining the integrity of the approved charter and the safety of the school population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensures compliance with established procedures and rules in daily operation of school, maintaining standards of conduct set forth by the school, the county, and the state. -Responsible for faculty/staff interviews, hiring, contracts, and evaluation. -Ensures commitment to school's mission and implements the school improvement plan. -Provides leadership in developing and fostering positive community relationships and effective communication with all stakeholders, including students, faculty/ staff, the governing Board, the Lions Council, and parents/guardians. -Ensures security, cleanliness, and maintenance of facilities and coordinates their utilization. -Coordinates the supervision of duty assignments and extra-curricular activities. -Responsible for timely reporting of school data and effective operation of the school, assisting in business management, budget development, and cost accounting -Provides effective leadership in implementing ethics and conduct in Teacher Procedural Manual and in assisting in professional development planning and delivery. -Ensures safety of school population by coordinating development and implementation of emergency plans and drills. -Ensures implementation of policies and programs for school technology, special needs populations, -Ensures proper purchasing and accounting/inventory of all school property. -Provides leadership in implementation of state standards and best practices that lead to student success.
Casteel, Angie	Assistant Principal	<p>The Principal of Upper School manages all aspects of student behavior/ attendance and teacher coaching/training in grades 6-12 in order to uphold the school's mission and ensure fidelity to the Hillsdale curriculum.</p>
Heaton, Lyna	Assistant Principal	<p>The Principal of Grammar School manages all aspects of student behavior/ attendance and teacher coaching/training in grades K-5 in order to uphold the school's mission and ensure fidelity to the Hillsdale curriculum.</p>

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.

Stakeholder involvement is very important to the success of St. Johns Classical Academy. In its seventh year of operations, the school continues to receive better involvement from all stakeholders. The school

leadership team, comprised of school administrators, grammar school team leads, and upper school department chairs meets regularly to discuss near-term and long-term school improvement issues. On a regular basis, teachers, school staff, and parents participate in surveys with the purpose of school improvement. Lions Council, the school’s parent-teacher association, helps determine the top issues of parents using data from the survey. Then, a townhall meeting is held where the school headmaster briefs the results of the survey along with the top issues, followed by a questions and answer segment. School administrators meet with Student Government to discuss student issues; there is also a comment box in the cafeteria. Lions Council oversees the community partners program and helps gather input.

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))

The school improvement plan will be monitored through quarterly analysis of measurable goals in the areas of focus and monthly administrator classroom walkthroughs to ensure fidelity to the chosen interventions. We will continue analyzing and observing to target the highest priorities for increasing student achievement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	3%
Charter School	Yes
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
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	13	3	6	4	5	8	6	4	7	56	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	9	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	15	10	7	23	18	97	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	25	15	4	6	3	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	24	15	10	7	23	18	97	

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	3	0	0	5	4	4	0	3	2	21	

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	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		
The number of students identified retained:		
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	13	3	6	4	5	8	6	4	7	56	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	9	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	15	10	7	23	18	97	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	25	15	4	6	3	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	24	15	10	7	23	18	97	

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	3	0	0	5	4	4	0	3	2	21	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
 Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.
On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	72	56	57	67	57	61
ELA Learning Gains	59	49	55	54	53	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51	37	46	44	53	54
Math Achievement*	71	57	55	60	52	62
Math Learning Gains	61	51	60	55	49	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56	44	56	52	46	52
Science Achievement*	65	57	51	61	54	56
Social Studies Achievement*	96	71	72	98	77	78
Middle School Acceleration	63			82		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	54			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK				
HSP	67			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	66			
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	72	59	51	71	61	56	65	96	63			
SWD	53	60	54	44	56	60	50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	70			80								
BLK												
HSP	72	66	50	69	65	52	72	92				
MUL	67	79		80	62							
PAC												
WHT	72	57	54	71	59	59	64	97	59			
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	68	51	38	66	59	59	64	96	68			
SWD	41	28	14	48	54	53	56					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN				80								
BLK	46			54								
HSP	74	53	43	65	46	43	68					
MUL	71			69								
PAC												
WHT	67	50	35	66	65	66	64	94	70			
FRL	60	36		53	9							

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	67	54	44	60	55	52	61	98	82			
SWD	36	39	40	40	50	53	23					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	42		57	50							
HSP	64	63	58	60	58	53	59					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	53	41	60	55	51	62	98	80			
FRL	56	48	45	49	39	24	55	100	80			

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	64%	57%	7%	50%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	54%	52%	2%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	51%	7%	47%	11%
09	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	48%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	58%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	47%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	76%	75%	1%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	75%	50%	25%	48%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	62%	12%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	67%	5%	61%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	70%	0%	55%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	55%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	44%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	63%	9%	51%	21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	68%	13%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	53%	29%	48%	34%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	73%	9%	63%	19%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	79%	6%	66%	19%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	77%	9%	63%	23%

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.

8th-grade science showed the lowest performance, and 7th/8th ELA scores are significantly lower than ELA scores in the rest of the school. Lower reading ability is likely contributing to lower science scores. In addition, for that class, we hired a new teacher mid-year in both their 7th and 8th grade years, and both of those teachers were new-to-teaching and working towards certification. We were also performing less walkthroughs and therefore not able to provide necessary feedback to these teachers.

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

Over three years, the percentage of eligible middle schoolers who passed a high school level EOC decreased from 80 (2019) to 68 (2020) to 63 (2021). One contributing factor is the instructional component. When the school opened 2017-2018, the math lacked pre-algebra instruction which created gaps in the years that followed. In addition, as we were initially increasing enrollment in grades 6-8, we were not suitably mindful about proper student placement in the algebra class.

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.

Our greatest gaps came in geometry and algebra: our geometry scores are 34 percentage points higher than the state, and our algebra scores are 31 percentage points higher. One factor that contributes to this is instruction; instructors for these classes are seasoned teachers, and we have provided training in instructing through Socratic questioning techniques that force students to explain their processes for solving math problems. Also, we provided students with access to testing practice resources, such as

iXL, and we required 10 minutes per night of practice. Another is afterschool tutorial time; our math teachers provide more tutorial time slots than other teachers. An additional factor is our peer tutorial program, which math teachers, especially algebra, utilize more than other departments. Peer tutors are recommended by teachers, trained by the program leader, and then paired with scholars who need weekly, one-to-one tutoring.

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

After comparing testing data from the 21-22 to the 22-23 school year, math in grade levels 3rd-8th is one of the data components that showed the most improvement. Each grade level increased except for 8th grade. When comparing 8th grade to the district, there was a 0% difference and a positive 15% compared to the state. Another area of most improvement was 5th grade science. There was a 14% increase.

Our school took new actions in math and science, such as providing resources and professional development. Teacher turnover was very low, and the teachers were able to build upon their foundation. Comparing our curriculum to the state standards helped the teachers know where the gaps were. The teachers were given iXL, a computer program, for the students to close those gaps. It also allowed the students to be exposed to questions that they may encounter on the state test.

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

The two potential areas of concern are the level 1 scores in ELA and math from 3rd to 8th grade.

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

1. Improve reading readiness among grades 3-8
2. Decrease number of level one scores in math grades 3-5
3. Increase science scores in grade 8

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have based this area of focus on state assessment data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome a 2-3 percentage point increase in ELA scores at each grade level, grades 3-8.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor by monitoring PM testing data throughout the year, administrator classroom walkthroughs, and bi-monthly, grade-level data analysis meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayla Flannagan (kayla.flannagan@myoneclay.net)

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.)

We will implement researched-based literacy instruction utilizing the Literacy Essentials curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Literacy Essentials is a comprehensive, evidence-based reading program that how teaches students to break the code of the language through direct instruction of the phonograms, also known as spelling patterns and rules of the English language. As a part of the LE program, McCall Crabbs testing provides data used to evaluate and monitor student growth in reading fluency and comprehension.

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.

Administrative classroom walkthroughs for each teacher to ensure fidelity to the curriculum with immediate feedback.

Person Responsible: Lyna Heaton (lyna.heaton@myoneclay.net)

By When: by the end of each month

Data is pulled, analyzed, and then presented to the administration.

Person Responsible: Kayla Flannagan (kayla.flannagan@myoneclay.net)

By When: At the end of each testing period

Administration meets with each grade level to analyze and create an action plan for needed students.

Person Responsible: Lyna Heaton (lyna.heaton@myoneclay.net)

By When: The end of the first quarter and continued bi-monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We have based this area of focus on state testing data in grades 3-5, teacher input, and classroom walkthroughs/observations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome is a 25% decrease in the number of level one scores from PM1 testing to PM3 testing.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor IXL use, state testing data, classroom data, and effective instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lyna Heaton (lyna.heaton@myoneclay.net)

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.)

IXL usage and fidelity to the Singapore Dimensions Math curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Both IXL and the Singapore Dimensions Math curriculum have strong evidence-based data to support improved outcomes in math.

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.

Require each teacher to identify areas of scholar weakness and implement daily, targeted IXL practice for 10-15 minutes.

Person Responsible: Lyna Heaton (lyna.heaton@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of August

Implement professional development for best practices in teaching Singapore Math and recognizing/targeting gaps in knowledge.

Person Responsible: Lyna Heaton (lyna.heaton@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter