# TROUT CREEK ACADEMY



# 2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

# School Board Approval

*A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.*

# SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

# SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

# 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.

# I. School Information

# A. School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

At Trout Creek Academy, we believe in nurturing curious minds and empowering students to discover their unique strengths. Our community is built on a foundation of integrity, where collaboration and mutual respect guide us. We support our students in overcoming obstacles, helping them to forge a purposeful path in their educational journey and beyond. Together, we inspire each individual to reach their full potential and create a brighter future.

**Provide the school's vision statement**

At Trout Creek Academy, we empower all students to persevere, discover their strengths, and excel in their educational journey and beyond.

# B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

## 1. School Leadership Membership

**School Leadership Team**
For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

## Leadership Team Member #1

**Employee's Name**
Katherine O'Connell

katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us

**Position Title**
Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Primary areas of focus include:
- PLC supervision
- Student and teacher recognition
- Staffing and supervision of staff mentorship

- Data review, presentation, goal setting
- Student and staff data chats

## Leadership Team Member #2

**Employee's Name**

David Barnes

David.Barnes@stjohns.k12.fl.us

**Position Title**

Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Primary areas of include:

- Middle school staff, student, and schedule management
- MTSS Lead for K-8
- LEA for Initial Staffing
- Safety
- Bus Transportation

## Leadership Team Member #3

**Employee's Name**

Samantha Sawruk

Samantha.Sawruk@stjohns.k12.fl.us

**Position Title**

Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Primary responsibilities include:

- K-5 staff, student, and schedule management
- School Advisory Committee (SAC)
- LEA for Re-evaluations and PK to K transitions
- Teacher Professional Learning for TIDE Sessions
- PPU/Walker Transportation
- Testing support
- Instructional resource management

## Leadership Team Member #4

**Employee's Name**

Stacey Cerda

stacey.cerda@stjohns.k12.fl.us

**Position Title**
Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Primary responsibilities include:
- EBD Program Management
- ESE staff schedules and management
- LEA for all annual meetings

# Leadership Team Member #5

**Employee's Name**
Christa Ritchie

christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us

**Position Title**
Instructional Literacy Coach

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Primary responsibilities include:
- Lead teacher coach
- Literacy Team facilitator
- Professional development point of contact
- Progress monitoring
- Deliberate growth plans
- Data chats with teachers/students

# 2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

*Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.*

School stakeholders are involved in all aspects of school performance and improvement.  Teachers,

staff, parents, students and business partners work together to review and analyze performance data and determine goals and actions.  Schoolwide performance data is shared with our school community and parents and teachers are surveyed for input and response.  Our SAC reviews the SIP and provides input and participates in ongoing progress monitoring.  Our community stakeholders support our positive culture goals as well by particpating in community events, providing recognition, and funding rewards.

## 3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

Our SIP is regularly monitored through weekly PLCs on grade level teams where they analyze students' performance and provide progress monitoring on specific grade level goals.  Teams are aware of students who are performing in the bottom quartile and smaller group sizes and additional supports are put in place to support those individual students who are falling below their grade level peers. Our CORE team regularly monitors student information including discipline data, attendance reports, early warning signs reports, Threat Assessment and behavior and mental health referrals in weekly team meetings to identify patterns and or areas of concern. The principal meets with the regional superintendent quarterly to review goals and progress. SIP data and progress reports are shared in monthly SAC and PTO meetings to engage business partners and families in our progress. If the plan needs to be revised, the school leaders adjust the plan and communicate changes to stakeholders.

# C. Demographic Data

| | |
|---|---|
| **2025-26 STATUS**<br>(PER MSID FILE) | **ACTIVE** |
| **SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED**<br>(PER MSID FILE) | **COMBINATION**<br>**KG-8** |
| **PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE**<br>(PER MSID FILE) | **K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION** |
| **2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS** | **NO** |
| **2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE** | **12.7%** |
| **CHARTER SCHOOL** | **NO** |
| **RAISE SCHOOL** | **NO** |
| **2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION**<br>*UPDATED AS OF 1 | **N/A** |
| **ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)** | |
| **2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED**<br>(SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)<br>(SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)**<br>**ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)**<br>**ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN)**<br>**BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)**<br>**HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)**<br>**MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)**<br>**WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)**<br>**ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)** |
| **SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY**<br>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.* | **2024-25: A**<br>**2023-24:**<br>**2022-23:**<br>**2021-22:**<br>**2020-21:** |

# D. Early Warning Systems

## 1. Grades K-8

**Current Year 2025-26**

Using 2024-25 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 | |
| School Enrollment | 140 | 138 | 174 | 148 | 177 | 151 | 186 | 161 | 156 | 1,431 |
| Absent 10% or more school days | | 30 | 23 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 215 |
| One or more suspensions | | 5 | 18 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 61 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | 10 | 26 | 9 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 92 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | 5 | 19 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 73 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | | 0 | 4 | 7 | | | | | | 11 |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4) | 0 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 3 | | | | | 17 |

**Current Year 2025-26**

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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 |

**Current Year 2025-26**

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days | 56 | 42 | 28 | 40 | 31 | 36 | 46 | 40 | | 319 |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

**Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

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 |

**Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

## 2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

# II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

# A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT | 2025 | | | 2024 | | | 2023** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† |
| ELA Achievement* | 79 | 78 | 61 | 74 | 78 | 59 | | 76 | 56 |
| Grade 3 ELA Achievement | 77 | 81 | 62 | 78 | 78 | 59 | | 76 | 56 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 73 | 68 | 61 | 65 | 65 | 59 | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 70 | 60 | 55 | 56 | 56 | 54 | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 85 | 83 | 62 | 81 | 81 | 59 | | 78 | 55 |
| Math Learning Gains | 80 | 75 | 60 | 74 | 74 | 61 | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 74 | 65 | 53 | 63 | 63 | 56 | | | |
| Science Achievement | 73 | 75 | 57 | 72 | 72 | 54 | 74 | 74 | 52 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 94 | 74 | | 91 | 72 | | 79 | 68 |
| Graduation Rate | | 75 | 72 | | 71 | 71 | | 82 | 74 |
| Middle School Acceleration | | 76 | 75 | | 73 | 71 | | 71 | 70 |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 33 | 56 | | 19 | 54 | | 32 | 53 |
| Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) | 74 | 66 | 61 | | 71 | 59 | | 70 | 55 |

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

# B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2024-25 ESSA FPPI | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students | 76% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI | 685 |
| Total Components for the FPPI | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Graduation Rate | |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2024-25 | 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21** | 2019-20* | 2018-19 |
| 76% | | | | | | |

\* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

\*\* Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

# C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| | 2024-25 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% |
| Students With Disabilities | 52% | No | | |
| English Language Learners | 73% | No | | |
| Asian Students | 87% | No | | |
| Black/African American Students | 75% | No | | |
| Hispanic Students | 82% | No | | |
| Multiracial Students | 73% | No | | |
| White Students | 76% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 67% | No | | |

# D. 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.

**2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2023-24 | C&C ACCEL 2023-24 | ELP PROGRESS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 79% | 77% | 73% | 70% | 85% | 80% | 74% | 73% | | | | | 74% |
| Students With Disabilities | 45% | 41% | 62% | 60% | 50% | 62% | 57% | 35% | | | | | |
| English Language Learners | 69% | | 73% | 74% | 76% | 75% | 67% | | | | | | 74% |
| Asian Students | 94% | 90% | 78% | | 94% | 81% | | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 66% | | 61% | | 90% | 83% | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 84% | 93% | 74% | 71% | 86% | 86% | 78% | 80% | | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | 78% | | 75% | 70% | 80% | 81% | 64% | 60% | | | | | |
| White Students | 78% | 72% | 72% | 71% | 84% | 78% | 73% | 76% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 67% | 64% | 66% | 59% | 70% | 69% | 76% | 67% | | | | | |

# E. 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.

| | | 2024-25 SPRING | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUBJECT | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| ELA | 3 | 76% | 77% | -1% | 57% | 19% |
| ELA | 4 | 78% | 75% | 3% | 56% | 22% |
| ELA | 5 | 79% | 73% | 6% | 56% | 23% |
| ELA | 6 | 77% | 76% | 1% | 60% | 17% |
| ELA | 7 | 79% | 74% | 5% | 57% | 22% |
| Math | 3 | 83% | 79% | 4% | 63% | 20% |
| Math | 4 | 86% | 79% | 7% | 62% | 24% |
| Math | 5 | 75% | 74% | 1% | 57% | 18% |
| Math | 6 | 85% | 81% | 4% | 60% | 25% |
| Math | 7 | 75% | 63% | 12% | 50% | 25% |
| Math | 8 | 100% | 83% | 17% | 57% | 43% |
| Science | 5 | 71% | 71% | 0% | 55% | 16% |
| Algebra | | 100% | 78% | 22% | 54% | 46% |

# III. Planning for Improvement

# A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Most Improvement**

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

When comparing our data to scores earned from our feeder schools during the 23-24 school year, we noted the following areas of growth:

1. During the 23-24 school year, African American students from our feeder schools showed proficiency ranging between 65%-67%.  Scores from the 24-25 school year showed this subgroup performed at 75% proficiency, an increase of 10%.

2. During the 23-24 school year, FRL students from our feeder schools showed proficiency of 64%. Scores from the 24-25 school year showed this subgroup performed at 67%, an increase of 3%.

3. During the 23-24 school year, SWD from our feeder schools performed at a proficiency level of 50%.  Scores from 24-25 school year showed this subgroup performed at 52%, an increase of 2%.

**Lowest Performance**

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

The 24-25 school year was our inaugural year at Trout Creek Academy.  When comparing our first-year scores to previous scores from our feeder schools, we showed growth in all areas.  Our lowest performing subgroups included:

1. Students with disabilities scored 52% proficiency (compared to 46% from TCE and 48% from HCE)

2. Free and reduced lunch students scored a 67% proficiency (compared to 64% from TCE and 67% from HCE)

3. English Language Learners scored 73% proficiency (compared to 45% from TCE - HCE did not have any score in this subcategory).

Overall proficiency in ELA was 79%, when compared to our primary feeder schools this was an overall proficiency increase of 5%.

This trend indicates that:

1. Students with disabilities demonstrated an average proficiency increase of 5%, which is the same growth rate as the overall school growth. In order to close the achievement gap, the rate of growth

needs to be higher than that of the overall school.

2. Free and reduced lunch students demonstrated a proficiency increase of 3% (which is 2% below the overall growth of the school).

3. English Language Learners demonstrated a proficiency growth rate of 22%, which was 17% higher than the overall school growth rate.

In order to continue to close achievement gaps among sub-groups, Trout Creek needs to see a higher proficiency growth rate among SWD compared to the overall school achievement growth rate.

**Greatest Decline**

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

Trout Creek Academy did not show a decline in any area compared the feeder school data from the previous year.

**Greatest Gap**

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.

Trout Creek Academy did not have any negative performance gaps compared to the state averages.

**EWS Areas of Concern**

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

Review of the Early Warning Systems indicates:

1. The number of students in grades K-2 (grades 1-3 for 25-26) who are not meeting grade level proficiency in reading is higher than the overall school (21%).

First Graders not meeting proficiency: 25%
Second Graders not meeting proficiency: 33%
Third Graders not meeting proficiency: 23%

**Highest Priorities**

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

Our highest priorities include:

1. Growth across both reading and math in our SWD subgroup.
2. Growth within the BQ, focus on reading.
3. Third grade reading proficiency levels.
4. First grade reading proficiency levels.
5. Implementation of PLC process and teacher retention.

# B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

## Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

## ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

In reviewing longitudinal data, it is evident that students with disabilities are performing significantly below grade level expectations with a persistent gap according to longitudinal data. Students in this subgroup demonstrated a 5% proficiency increase, which was the same growth rate as the school.  In order to close the achievement gap in this subgroup, their growth must be higher than the growth rate of the school.

### Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Trout Creek Academy expects to see overall reading proficiency of students with disabilities to increase to 50% proficient.

Historical data:
2025 SWD overall reading proficiency = 45%

### Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

A primary instructional focus for the 25-26 school year is element 3: Closing the Achievement Gap. Our staff will participate in monthly professional learning addressing strategies to address achievement gaps.  The administrative team is doing a book study utilizing CARE: Strategies for Closing Achievement Gaps by NEA. Strategies and activities from the book study will be used to plan grade level professional learning sessions each month.  Grade levels will also utilize the PLC process to track student performance on Common Summative Assessments, to ensure all students are making adequate progress.  At the first meeting of the school year, teams identified students in the

SWD subgroup and looked at their longitudinal progress.  All students will maintain a data binder that shows the ongoing data as well as district created performance indicators. Teachers will conference with students and parents throughout the year to discuss data and will create targeted intervention groups to provide remedial instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**
Katie O'Connell, David Barnes, Sam Sawruk, Stacey Cerda and Christa Ritchie

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**
Inclusive scheduling Support Faciliation Services Remediation blocks Research based instructional materials

**Rationale:**
Inclusive scheduling: ensure all service schedules are structured to best utilize instructional time Push-in services: ensure students remain present in the classroom for all Tier 1 instructional while being supported in those skills requiring remediation Remediation blocks: daily blocks of time scheduled in the students' instructional day to create frequent and repeated opportunities to remediate deficient skills Research based instructional materials: utilizing the district adopted instructional materials such as Savvas, FUNdations, etc. to ensure the highest quality instruction possible.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**
No

**Action Steps to Implement:**
Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Inclusive Scheduling

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| David Barnes, Stacey Cerda and Sam Sawruk | Quarterly (or as needed with new staffings) |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
Maintain inclusive scheduling spreadsheets and tracking documents to ensure schedules are kept up to date. Utilize daily common intervention blocks for quality instructional practices.

**Action Step #2**
Support Facilitation Model

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|

David Barnes, Stacey Cerda and Sam Sawruk        Quarterly (or as needed)

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
Promote push-in services to reduce the amount of time SWD spend outside of the General Education Classroom setting.

**Action Step #3**
Remediation Blocks and Common Intervention Times

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
| --- | --- |
| David Barnes, Sam Sawruk and Christa Ritchie | (Quarterly- or as needed to be adjusted) |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
All grade levels, K-8 have common remediation and intervention times. These are designated times on the master schedule. For grades K-5, a building support staff member will be assigned to assist in reducing group sizes and providing targeted interventions to students. Grades 2 and 3 will also have additional intervention support for students in the bottom quartile. Groups are fluid and are adjusted several times throughout the quarter based on student need and progress. Intervention materials will include research-based programs and adopted curricular materials including Phonics for Reading, Rewards, Passport and Read 180. Third grade students will utilize district-adopted reteaching materials.

# Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

## Graduation/Acceleration specifically relating to Acceleration

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

St Johns County School District has a district-wide initiative to increase acceleration rates for all students.  In order to support this district initiative, we would like to focus on increasing our math acceleration rate at Trout Creek Academy. The number of students eligible for acceleration was 103, and we have 100 students placed for 25-26. In order to reach our acceleration goal, 93 students need to pass the Algebra EOC.

**Measurable Outcome**
Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to achieve an acceleration rate of 90%.

**Monitoring**
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We will utilize common summative assessments and student progress on classroom formatives to measure student progress.   In March 2026, we will offer the PSAT-8/9 test to any eight-grade student enrolled in Algebra 1 or Geometry.  This assessment provides specific feedback to teachers, parents and students regarding a student's level of understanding of high school mathematical concepts.  The spring testing timeframe will allow time for students to receive additional support in targeted areas to promote mastery of accelerated math concepts.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**
Katie O'Connell and David Barnes (Middle School AP)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**
Automatic acceleration for students scoring a mid-level three or higher in the area of math beginning in grade 6. Weekly Support Block in middle school schedule.

**Rationale:**
Beginning in fifth grade, any student scoring above a mid-level three will be automatically accelerated in mathematics for the upcoming school year. District-wide data has shown that when given an opportunity to accelerate, 95% of students are successful and pass the EOC for Algebra 1 in middle school.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**
No

**Action Steps to Implement:**
Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Automatic Acceleration Scheduling

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| Katie O'Connell and David Barnes | Ongoing during student scheduling |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
When scheduling for the upcoming school year, students who scored a mid-level three or higher will be automatically placed in accelerated math for the next year. School staff will communicate the benefits of middle school acceleration to parents and students to promote the practice.

**Action Step #2**
Weekly Support Block in Master Schedule

**Person Monitoring:**                          **By When/Frequency:**
David Barnes (Middle School AP)                 Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
The master schedule for grades 6-8 will include a weekly support block for students to obtain additional support in various academic areas. This time can be used to support students who may be struggling in math.

# IV. Positive Learning Environment

## Area of Focus #1

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Through our continued focus on retaining teachers, celebrating positivity, supporting teachers, and celebrating leaders we have identified a common theme of positivity and have will continue as a certified Energy Bus School.

### Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Increase in student recognition, positive interactions, decrease in suspensions and improved parent participation in positive celebrations.

### Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will track the number of students and staff recognized for their positivity. We will survey parents and community members to ascertain impact on community. We will see a decrease in referrals and an increase in teacher retention.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Katherine O'Connell

### Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable

outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**
Teacher Shout Outs Energy Bus CEOs Stake-holder surveys "Stay Interviews"

**Rationale:**
Teacher Shout Outs: Administrative team does weekly shout out for teachers and staff as they model student engagement, instruction, and learning. Energy Bus CEOs: Each month, each homeroom identifies a student who has been a model of positivity that aligns to our Energy Bus initiative and the "5 Rules" Stake-holder surveys: We will conduct surveys at the end of the year to measure student, family, and staff satisfaction with TCA. "Stay Interviews": receive positive feedback from staff who stay year-to-year to see what the team has done to earn trust, foster positive relationships, and make TCA a positive place to work. We will capitalize on strengths and remain open to constructive feedback.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**
No


**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Weekly Staff Shout Outs

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| Katie O'Connell, David Barnes, Sam Sawruk and Stacey Cerda | Weekly |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
Take picture of model actions throughout the week and highlight that terrific work for the whole staff in weekly Shout Out emails.

**Action Step #2**
Energy Bus Monthly Chief Energy Officers (CEOs)

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| David Barnes | Monthly |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
Work with one of the resource teachers to ensure that teachers have submitted monthly student CEOs, print the certificates, and plan the recognition.

**Action Step #3**
Stakeholder Survey

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| Katie O'Connell and Sam Sawruk | 1x at the end of the school year |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Work with the yearly SAC survey to get survey data from stakeholders on their feelings on TCA throughout the year and identify areas for improvement.

**Action Step #4**
Stay Interviews

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| Katie O'Connell, David Barnes, Sam Sawruk and Stacey Cerda | 1x at the end of the year |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
Conduct teacher interviews at the end of the year from those teachers staying to get feedback on what went well and constructive feedback on what can be improved for the following year. The team would use that data to plan next steps for the 26-27 school year.

# V. Title I Requirements (optional)

# A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Dissemination Methods**

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

**Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders**

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

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

**Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program**

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

**How Plan is Developed**

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

# B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

## Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

### Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

### Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

### Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

### Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

### Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

# VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSIor CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

**Process to Review the Use of Resources**
Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

SJCSD forms curriculum and assessment cadre teams each summer to develop common formative and summative assessments for each grade level.  The district sets a schedule of assessments that will be tracked district wide.  This allows schools to monitor their growth and progression over the course of the year in comparison to other schools across the district.  Common intervention materials are reviewed and compiled by the cadre to provide teachers with effective intervention materials.

**Specifics to Address the Need**
Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

RTI- MTSS Process

Daily FLOW Groups (K-5) and Weekly CREEK Time (6-8).

Differentiated instruction within class and among grade level.

Collective Teacher Efficacy has the highest yield effect on student performance. This collective partnership is implemented through our PLC process which uses data-based decision making to drive instruction.

Review individual student data and create an inclusive master schedule to include support facilitation at every grade level.

Quarterly progress reports and progress monitoring.

Analyzing growth trends quarterly to adjust instruction and intervention as needed.

Provide additional building support to grade levels based on comparative growth data between TCA and schools district-wide.

# VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.                    **No**

| BUDGET | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/ OBJECT | FUNDING SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Plan Budget Total | | | | | 0.00 |