South Woods Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South Woods Elementary School

4750 SR 206 W, Elkton, FL 32033

http://www-swe.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Randy Kelley

Start Date for this Principal: 9/10/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: B 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Dustin Sims]
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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.](http://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

South Woods Elementary School will create a positive learning environment that will instill good character and the desire for academic excellence, fostering the development of caring, productive, and digital citizens in the global world.

Provide the school's vision statement

South Woods students will communicate, collaborate, and solve problems in all academic areas to a high standard. Our students will have the necessary digital skills to perform in the school/home/work place and in the global society in which they live. Students will be lifelong learners that exhibit good character and contributors to their neighborhood, community and world.

At South Woods, we believe that:
~ the school serves and exists to provide the best educational opportunity for all.
~ the best educational environment is one which makes available opportunities to practice basic skills, receive instruction in the various disciplines, use technology tools, and provide rigor in the curriculum.
~ the best educational opportunities allow each student to learn to his/her fullest potential.
~ each student should be able to learn whatever he or she is studying while demonstrating a level of mastery in all grade level standards.
~ efficient learning requires a planned sequence of teaching / learning experiences aimed at specific goals.
~ education's purpose is to help students become independent, self-directed individuals capable of achieving goals while also serving the good of society.
~ school must help students to increase their self-respect, respect of others, appreciation of differences, and understanding that developing good character should be a priority.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kelley, Randy	Principal	
Ambrose, Diana	Guidance Counselor	
Witt, Bennie	Other	
Cunningham, Sally	Instructional Coach	
Bielefeldt, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
English, Dana	Administrative Support	
Vitolo, Fannethia	Instructional Coach	
Ramos, Nicole	Attendance/Social Work	
Fuce, Linda	Other	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	117	89	114	96	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	18	23	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	6	8	5	20	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	4	0	10	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	9	11	11	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	6	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
58

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	18	20	15	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	2	6	6	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	1	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	18	20	15	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	2	6	6	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	1	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	75%	57%	45%	72%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	67%	58%	36%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	59%	53%	32%	50%	48%
Math Achievement	66%	77%	63%	66%	77%	62%
Math Learning Gains	70%	69%	62%	59%	67%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	59%	51%	44%	58%	47%
Science Achievement	60%	72%	53%	42%	68%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	102 (0)	117 (0)	89 (0)	114 (0)	96 (0)	89 (0)	607 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	23 (19)	25 (18)	18 (20)	23 (15)	11 (7)	16 (16)	116 (95)
One or more suspensions	6 (2)	8 (6)	5 (6)	20 (5)	18 (4)	8 (5)	65 (28)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (1)	1 (3)	9 (2)	24 (6)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	14 (14)	24 (25)	39 (41)

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

NOTE: 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**
03	2019	50%	78%	-28%	58%	-8%
	2018	60%	78%	-18%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	77%	-27%	58%	-8%
	2018	38%	74%	-36%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison	-10%					
05	2019	53%	76%	-23%	56%	-3%
	2018	38%	73%	-35%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison	15%					
Cohort Comparison	15%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	68%	82%	-14%	62%	6%
	2018	69%	80%	-11%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	82%	-19%	64%	-1%
	2018	65%	83%	-18%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					
05	2019	65%	80%	-15%	60%	5%
	2018	62%	79%	-17%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	60%	73%	-13%	53%	7%
	2018	43%	73%	-30%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	28	48	48	39	53	52	37				
BLK	47	52		40	61		50				
HSP	41	54		71	92						
MUL	50			60							
WHT	56	62	60	74	70	59	67				
FRL	53	63	59	66	75	63	62				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	20	22	24	43	47	45	12				
BLK	32	31	38	47	41	42	11				
HSP	35	25		74	81						
MUL	40			50							
WHT	49	40	31	71	62	46	51				
FRL	36	31	33	62	53	43	33				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	65
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	55
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	
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	64
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	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

The ELA achievement (53%) was the lowest performing area. Although achievement increased 8% this past year, contributing factors including lack of parental participation in student learning, student absenteeism and teachers new to the school and assessed grade level have an impact on consistent growth from year to year.

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

None of the school grade component areas declined from last year, but Math achievement remained the same at 66%.

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

The math learning gains had the largest gap when compared to the state average but we scored 8% higher than the state average. ELA achievement (53%) was 4% below the state level. Although achievement increased 8% this past year, contributing factors including lack of parental participation in student learning, student absenteeism and teachers new to the school and assessed grade level have an impact on consistent growth from year to year.

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

The ELA learning gains showed the most improvement increasing from 36% in 2018 to 60% in 2019. New actions our school took were increased accountability and monitoring of interventions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Based on the EWS data, our area of concern is student attendance and out of school suspensions.

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

1. Increased accountability and monitoring of Tier 1 instruction
2. Increased accountability and monitoring of interventions for students with Tier 2 and 3 plans, students with IEPs, and students in the lowest quartile in reading and math
3. Targeted professional development for teachers and interventionist in reading, writing and math
4. Increased monitoring and follow up for student attendance and out of school suspensions
5. Increased opportunity for parent participating in student learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	According to the 2019 FSA data, 58% of the lowest quartile students demonstrated learning gains in math.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math learning gains lowest quartile by 2%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Leadership Team will monitor effectiveness by attending grade level PLCs, tracking student data, and tracking teacher observations. Throughout the year, the leadership team will track iReady Math data with the 2020 Math FSA data being used as our final indicator. Teachers will work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Math student data and teacher observations are being used because they are measurable. Collaborative teams will work together to increase proficiancy and learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	Collaborative team determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data and plan for instruction. Reteaching and interventions will occur based on data from student formative and summative assessments.
Person Responsible	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	According to the 2019 FSA data, 55% of the lowest quartile students demonstrated learning gains in ELA.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA learning gains lowest quartile by 2%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Leadership Team will monitor effectiveness by attending grade level PLCs, tracking student data, and tracking teacher observations. Throughout the year, the leadership team will track iReady ELA data with the 2020 ELA FSA data being used as our final indicator. Teachers will work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ELA student data and teacher observations are being used because they are measurable. Collaborative teams will work together to increase proficiancy and learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	Collaborative team determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data and plan for instruction. Reteaching and interventions will occur based on data from student formative and summative assessments.
Person Responsible	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Attendance/Behavior
Rationale	When reviewing the Early Warning Systems data, the number of students with one or more suspensions increased from 28 to 65. The number of students that had an attendance rate below 90%, increased from 95 students to 116 students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of 2019-2020 we will reduce absenteeism by 2% and decrease the number of out of school suspensions by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through weekly Core MTSS meetings the data for attendance and student behavior resulting in suspensions will be monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The MTSS Core team will monitor student data for attendance and suspensions. Team members have the resources to support students who demonstrate poor attendance or struggle with behavior that results in suspension from school.
Action Step	
Description	The MTSS Core team monitors student attendance and discipline data including suspensions weekly. The team takes action to support and follow up weekly and progress. For students who continue to demonstrate concern, the team will meet to develop an intervention plan.
Person Responsible	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Parental Involvement is very important to having a successful Title 1 program. Our district distributes a Title I handbook to all families. Parents, teachers, and students sign our school

learning agreement that focuses on shared responsibility for student achievement. The learning agreement is reviewed at parent conferences during the school year. Our Title 1 program that includes current curriculum and assessments are explained at our Title 1 Curriculum Night. The districts coordinates with the Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

About 60% of our students attend Pre-K prior to starting kindergarten. South Woods has had a limited number of slots where typical 4 year old students join a VPK/ESE classroom at our school. Our school also serves HeadStart Students, which also allows students to have the full school experience. These students are provided a school experience throughout the school year with a certified teacher and VPK endorsed teacher. South Woods has collaborated with local day care facilities to schedule visits to our school in the spring. These students come and tour our school and visit a kindergarten classroom.

This year we have a blended program of ESE, HeadStart, and typical VPK students. Students are provided a full day of experiences with certified teachers. Having these programs in our school allows students to have a smooth transition into kindergarten as well as assist them academically. Also, we have four self-contained classrooms for students identified with emotional or behavioral disabilities, and two self-contained classrooms for students identified with intellectual disabilities or on the autism spectrum. Many of these students participate with non-disabled peers for resource classes and some core academic instruction.

Our school also has a robust mentoring program where members of the community mentor identified students under the guidance of our school counselor. Additional, student receive mental health service through a district based mental health counselor and through a partnership with Children's Home Society. Finally, our students participate in weekly social skills instruction grounded in the pillars of Character Counts!

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

South Woods Elementary uses the 4-step problem-solving model:
Step 1 - Define the goal.
Step 2 - Identify why the desired goal is not being attained.
Step 3- Develop and implement a plan.
Step 4 - Evaluate the effectiveness of the plan.

Teachers use assessment data to drive instruction and plan differentiated instruction that meets students at their reading and math level. SWES utilizes MTSS/RtI to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction for struggling students.

The focus at SWES this year is to see an improvement in ELA and Math learning gains for our lowest quartile. Our ILC along with our district CAST team members will provide PD sessions on reading and math strategies that align with the curriculum map and core standards.

Title I
South Woods Elementary is a Title I School wide due to the Economically Disadvantaged population that we serve. All compliance measures are implemented and documented through the Federal Programs Office at the St. Johns County School District.

Title I, Part C - Migrant
A Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D
District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach Program. Services are coordinated with district Dropout Prevention Programs.

Title II
Title II funds will support the delivery of Professional Development for the 2019-2020 school year.

Title III
Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Head Start
South Woods has 4 classrooms that serve a total of 18 students, ages 3-4 who meet the criteria for Head Start. This year we are using the blended model (6-6-6) with Head Start, VPK, and ESE students.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

NA

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

South Woods supports college and career readiness through the use of organizational tools, goal setting, and through school and classroom visuals that support secondary education. Additionally as a Community Partnership School our student and families work with multiple support agencies include our core partners of St. Johns River State College, Flagler Health, Children's Home Society and the St. Johns County School District.