St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Augustine High School

3205 VARELLA AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

Demographics

Principal: Dearmas Graham

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

SAHS will prepare all students for college and careers through rigorous and diverse programs of study which inspire good character and individual talents and abilities via an accepting and rewarding environment.

Provide the school's vision statement

Jacket Pride: Trust. Teamwork. Tenacity. Triumph... Tradition

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Graham, DeArmas	Principal	
Wimpelberg, Ashley	Registrar	
Davis, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Lee, Jill	Assistant Principal	
Gaynor, Sherry	Other	
Hazel, Mike	Other	
Lipovetsky, Serge	Other	
Naughton, Heather	Other	
Wallner, John	Dean	
King, Wayne	Other	
Lopez Cortes, Ruth	Dean	
Ranick, Richard	Dean	
Abbs, Trevor	Assistant Principal	
James, Corie	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Dearmas Graham

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516	487	408	391	1802
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	85	86	99	354
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	72	29	34	230
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	85	77	50	301
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	86	78	50	303
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	54	41	40	244
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	96	88	77	388

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	22	20	20	96
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	7	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490	444	395	367	1696
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	109	151	99	439
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	86	72	41	284
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	70	55	17	175
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	50	31	32	217

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	81	79	39	279

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	23	18	0	62
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	7	6	33

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490	444	395	367	1696
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	109	151	99	439
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	86	72	41	284
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	70	55	17	175
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	50	31	32	217

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	81	79	39	279

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	23	18	0	62
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	7	6	33

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	65%	74%	56%	64%	67%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	60%	51%	56%	59%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	42%	38%	52%	44%
Math Achievement	58%	73%	51%	59%	66%	51%
Math Learning Gains	56%	58%	48%	55%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	45%	42%	52%	45%
Science Achievement	88%	86%	68%	75%	78%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	88%	73%	82%	81%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	65%	75%	-10%	55%	10%
	2018	63%	74%	-11%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	68%	74%	-6%	53%	15%
	2018	64%	76%	-12%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	90%	87%	3%	67%	23%
2018	74%	84%	-10%	65%	9%
Compare		16%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	86%	88%	-2%	70%	16%
2018	81%	87%	-6%	68%	13%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	39%	79%	-40%	61%	-22%
2018	50%	79%	-29%	62%	-12%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	75%	81%	-6%	57%	18%
2018	64%	77%	-13%	56%	8%
Compare		11%			

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	29	39	31	28	35	29	64	56		82	29
ASN	85	77									
BLK	35	47	37	32	45	46	71	61		77	43
HSP	65	46	33	69	66	40	93	78		85	67
MUL	50	61		61	53		73				
WHT	71	60	45	64	57	51	90	89		89	70
FRL	46	49	39	43	48	36	81	72		77	48

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	25	41	34	29	31	27	45	54		61	15
ASN	87	60		90	70						
BLK	39	41	35	41	45	37	57	58		77	35
HSP	66	64	33	59	61	80	55	84		76	52
MUL	60	50		67	70		70	75		91	80
WHT	68	59	41	63	56	40	82	86		81	67
FRL	53	50	34	53	49	41	66	73		70	47

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	65
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	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	64
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
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	54
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 data component that performed the lowest was the English Language Arts lowest 25 percentile. This category had 42% receive learning gains compared to the state average of 42%. This has been a low data component score for the last three years and has improved from 2018 years 38% proficiency.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline was the Math Achievement which declined from 59% to 58%. This decline could be within the margin of error for fluctuation from year to year. In the other two categories for math: learning gains and learning gains within the lowest 25% we showed improvement. This indicates that we should have improved in overall math achievement. One reason that we did not improve in this area is that the students entered at a lower level, were able to improve, just not enough to show mastery in the topic.

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

We were able to close the achievement gap in all of the categories compared to the state. We were able to score higher than or match the state in every category. The two areas that were the closest to the state average were English Language Arts and Math Learning gains for the lowest quartile. The improvement in this are could be due to an increased focus on the lowest 25% as well as the implementation of a remediation period to focus on areas were students need improvement. In previous years we have fallen below the state average and or matched these categories.

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

The area that showed the most improvement is the Science achievement. This increased from 75% to 88%. The Science department has historically performed well. The increase in Science achievement could be a result of the remediation period. The Science department also participates in an active PLC group where they share best practices and other teaching strategies to improve student achievement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

An area that is of potential concern is the the number of students that display two or more early warning indicators; especially in the 9th and 10th grade. The amount of students that arrive at St. Augustine High School and receive a level one score is high compared to all of the other grade levels. The amount of students displaying more that one indicator to be at risk is also higher in the lower grade levels.

Another area that is of concern is the increased amount of attendance issues as students progress to higher grade levels.

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

1. Math Learning Gains
2. English Language Arts Learning Gains
3. Positive Culture & Environment
4. Attendance
5. New Teacher Training
6. Schoolwide/Classroom Communication

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	St. Augustine High School has set a goal of increasing the learning gains in the lowest 25% from 48% in 2018-2019 to 60% during the current 2020-2021 school year.
Measureable Outcome:	St. Augustine High School has set a goal of increasing the learning gains in the lowest 25% from 48% in 2018-2019 to 60% during the current 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jenna Yow (jenna.yow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the Kagan Strategies and technological resources to help students that may have difficulty attaining a proficient score on a state assessment The math department as well as the entire school is participating in PLC groups. While in these groups teachers are working on common assessments that are being written with a focus on aligning the tests to the state standards. The data on these common assessments is being analyzed to determine what students have learned and where teachers should focus more effort to ensure that the standards are being learned. We are also continuing to have a full support teacher in classes that contain a larger ESE population. These teachers are in the core math classes four days a week providing differentiated instruction for our lower quartile of students; thus increasing learning gains for those students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have seen success with these strategies in previous years. Through the PLC process we should expect to see learning gains as we identify specific student needs. Kagan strategies have shown to increase student interest and learning. The math standards require students to show a deep understanding and application of the math. The strategies used will incorporate students having to work with the math; replacing the work on the math problem mentality and therefore increasing proficiency on the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Within the PLCs from each subject teams will:
1. Analyze data from district and state assessments.
2. Develop a Smart goal of which standards are key for each course.
3. Establish the best practices and methods to teach the most important material as well as develop common summative assessments.
4. Share common assessment data to identify where students succeeded or did not reach desired achievement.
5. Develop a plan for what to do when students do not master the material.

Person Responsible	Michelle Davis (michelle.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: SAHS will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in reading and writing. Rationale: The English Language Arts lowest 25% showed the least amount of students that showed learning gains. Reading and writing are pillars for all classes and improving these scores will aide students in other state tests such as the Biology and History Florida Standards Assessment.
Measureable Outcome:	St. Augustine High School showed that 42% of the lowest quartile of students showed learning gains in English Language Arts. Are goal is to increase the learning gains to 50% for the lowest 25%. St. Augustine is also setting goals to increase the learning gains for students not in the lowest quartile from 58% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Macclary (danielle.macclary@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC Groups are formed to encourage teacher collaboration to ensure best practices in the classroom. The focus English teachers and Reading teachers will be to focus on the key standards for each unit, develop common summative assessments, then compare data on the common summative tests to ensure that students are achieving the desired result. Literacy Leadership team having bi-weekly discussions involving scaffolding up to the January/February writing task. ACHIEVE 3000 program will also be used for Intensive Reading and select ELA/Social Studies courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC groups will be able to identify strategies that are most effective; being able to analyze more data collaboratively than with one teacher alone. The scaffolding developed at these meetings will be adjusted based off of the results from the common summative assessments data from the PLC groups. We are following the Dufour model for the PLC which has shown success in many of the schools that have implemented the PLC programs correctly.

Action Steps to Implement

Within the PLCs from each subject teams will:
1. Analyze data from district and state assessments.
2. Develop a Smart goal of which standards are key for each course.
3. Establish the best practices and methods to teach the most important material as well as develop common summative assessments.
4. Share common assessment data to identify where students succeeded or did not reach desired achievement.
5. Develop a plan for what to do when students do not master the material.

Person Responsible	Michelle Davis (michelle.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. Rationale: Graduation is one of the primary goals of the education system. Improving the amount of students that graduate on time is always a focus at St. Augustine High School. While focusing on improving graduation St. Augustine High School will also be able to address and focus on several other key areas such as attendance. We also have 19.6% of students that have attendance below 90% and 12.7% that have had one or more suspensions last year. Increasing the a universal support can help with attendance and we can have more individualized support for students that are at risk to help with attendance and disciplinary issues.
Measureable Outcome:	St. Augustine High School is setting a goal to increase the graduation rate from 87% to 90% of students who graduate on time. This long term goal is one that St. Augustine High School continues to work towards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Lee (jill.lee@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing the graduation rate is linked to increasing the attendance at St. Augustine High School. Amy Arnow: Attendance Dean and Educational Diagnostician whose primary role is to handle attendance issues by contacting students, parents, and teachers. In order to keep students on track for graduation St. Augustine High school has implemented two mentoring programs the Sting program and the LINK crew program. Students that are incoming freshman are assigned a student mentor at SAHS. The program that SAHS is using is LINK Crew for monitoring transitions from one school to another and one grade to another. We also have the "Sting" mentor program for target students that are identified as needed extra mentoring. Teacher mentor these students throughout their 4 years at SAHS. St. Augustine High School has also continuing the remediation period. During this period teachers are working with students and focusing on missed material.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Identification of students that are at risk is paramount to being able to help them. Studies have also shown that students that have a strong role model is linked to student academic success and behavior. The mentoring programs aim to help students that are in need of guidance as well aid them towards positive behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that are at risk by running school-wide reports
a. The MTSS team that has an agenda that discusses SIP goals, core instruction, resource allocation, teacher support systems, and small group needs. During the meetings discussions

are held pertaining to individual student needs for students that are at risk.
2. Jacket Up Program is an incentive program that will highlight students that are doing well in school. Students will be rewarded and recognized for items such as: being on time, doing well in class, being positive, etc.
b. Jacket Swarm and Link Crew. goal is to encourage students to get involved in after school activities. Studies have shown that students that participate in extracurricular activities are more likely to show success in academics as well. Link Crew has student mentors that make the transition into high school for ninth graders smoother.

Person Responsible Ruth Lopez Cortes (ruthlopezcortes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. Attendance: St. Augustine High School's leadership team has several plans in place to increase the attendance of students during our current pandemic. Teachers are being asked to teach both in class brick and mortar as well as simultaneously to any distance learner students. This model will allow for any students that may have been absent from school in the past to still be present for the lesson and increase overall learning as compared to being absent in previous school years.

Our MTSS team and guidance counselors have worked with families to ensure that our students have the technology necessary to complete school remotely or on campus.

2. New teacher training: Our new teachers have all been paired with mentors throughout the school to assist them during their first year of teaching. St. Augustine High School has also given new teachers several instructional training to help insure best practices are being utilized within the classroom. New teachers are also placed with a PLC team to help with lesson planning, summative/formative assessments to make it more of a team environment.

3. School-Wide and Classroom Communication: Schoology is being utilized by our teachers and administration to communicate with student, staff, and each other. Teachers were given a training on how to utilize Schoology to communicate with students, perform synchronization with online instruction as well as share resources within their departments.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

MTSS/Counseling support is provided when an individual student is in need. Some students are provided a GO pass to aide in day to day positive behavior.

Jacket 101 will be implemented for all 9th graders to emphasize this expected culture and increase of student learning.

We also have the Jacket-Up incentive program, we have established a way for teachers to provide daily, monthly and quarterly awards that will highlight students who staff nominates for collaborating in creating a positive culture and learning environment. Thanks to Zaxby's and Mellow Mushroom we have been able to celebrate students who demonstrate the pillars of character and/or have shown improvement in such through quarterly luncheons. The PTO also provides support with incentives as well as financially supporting the program.

The Jacket-Up incentive program also includes a team of students called the Jacket-Up SWARM who help plan events throughout the school year to celebrate their peers as well as increase school morale and encourage all students to be involved, make a positive influence on their school, and be successful.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**