

St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 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 | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | [not available] |
| * 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 | Lead teachers and staff |
| Abbs, Trevor | Assistant Principal | Supervise deans and discipline |
| Davis, Michelle | Assistant Principal | Lead and supervise Curriculum |
| Lee, Jill | Assistant Principal | Lead and Supervise ESE |
| Woodall, Danielle | Instructional Coach | Assist and support reading teachers |
| Cooper, Quinterrance | Other | Athletic Director |
| Zapata, Ashley | Math Coach | Assist and support math teachers |
| Billoch, Monica | Registrar | |
| Raimann, Robert | Other | Career Specialist |

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

103

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,793

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

30

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

30

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 0 | 471 | 464 | 443 | 415 | 1793 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 137 | 143 | 132 | 554 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 55 | 35 | 20 | 186 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 160 | 132 | 89 | 527 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 81 | 48 | 34 | 271 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 143 | 138 | 118 | 93 | 492 |

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 | 89 | 90 | 60 | 37 | 276 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 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 |

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | 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 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 61% | | | 65% | 74% | 56% | 64% | 67% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | | | 58% | 60% | 51% | 56% | 59% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | | | 42% | 50% | 42% | 38% | 52% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | | | 58% | 73% | 51% | 59% | 66% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | | | 56% | 58% | 48% | 55% | 55% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | | | 48% | 55% | 45% | 42% | 52% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 74% | | | 88% | 86% | 68% | 75% | 78% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 78% | | | 83% | 88% | 73% | 82% | 81% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 75% | -10% | 55% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 74% | -6% | 53% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| 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 | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 90% | 87% | 3% | 67% | 23% | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 86% | 88% | -2% | 70% | 16% | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 39% | 79% | -40% | 61% | -22% | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 75% | 81% | -6% | 57% | 18% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 23 | 44 | 41 | 27 | 36 | 31 | 42 | 50 | | 77 | 23 |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 63 | 60 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 35 | 31 | 18 | 28 | 29 | 42 | 48 | | 91 | 39 |
| HSP | 57 | 60 | 47 | 55 | 45 | 46 | 100 | 89 | | 92 | 39 |
| MUL | 69 | 58 | | 65 | 53 | | 85 | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 64 | 60 | 60 | 49 | 46 | 77 | 84 | | 86 | 69 |
| FRL | 42 | 48 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 39 | 64 | 61 | | 80 | 45 |

| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| 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 Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | [not available] |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 73 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 681 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 73 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 62 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 63 |
| 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 | 66 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends that emerge across grade levels:

Student failure and suspensions are higher in 9th grade and then decline as students reach 12th grade.

Subgroup trends:

Students that have a socioeconomic disadvantage score lower than the school average in most core content areas.

Hispanic students seem to have a large gap within their subgroup. The lowest 25% of Hispanic students are some of the lowest scores in the school. Hispanic students that are not in that lowest quartile score among the highest in the school across math and English language arts.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Black students demonstrate the greatest need for improvement based on the 2019 assessment. For this subgroup the Math Achievement level was 32% with learning gains of 45%. The school average was 55% for achievement and 56% for learning gains. A data point to take notice to is that the lowest 25% of black students learning gains was 46%, with the entire group having learning gains of 45% for math. This could indicate that either St. Augustine High is doing very well at reaching our lowest 25% in this category or it would indicate that we need to focus more efforts on all students as well as the lowest 25%. Similar trends could be found within the English Language Arts results from 2018 to 2019 data.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

As stated before the need for improvement could be in indicator of allocating resources and energy toward the lowest 25% to get those student to perform better. We would need to include programs that can focus on all students as well as the lowest quartile to help ensure a more even distribution of improvement.

One of the actions that we are going to is a refocus on literacy strategies across the curriculum for all topics. Within this subgroup building knowledge and vocabulary could be very useful. Relevant background knowledge and vocabulary largely determine how well students understand what they read. We can bolster students' comprehension of grade-level text by building knowledge and vocabulary in a variety of ways.

Other areas that would need to be addressed is keeping the minority group in school and engaged in school. A strategy here would be to mentor and make efforts to show the importance of school as well as make efforts in making sure that there is an extracurricular activity that could get them involved.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area that showed the most improvement is the Science achievement category. The scores increased from 74% to 90% on the Biology EOC.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The Science department has historically performed well in years past. During the 2019 year there was a refocus on Literacy Strategies within the Science department that could have increased the results for the Biology EOC. The improvements in science The Science department also participates in an active PLC group where they share best practices and other teaching strategies to improve student achievement.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Prioritizing Standards:

Not all standards are created equal, yet sometimes all are given equal instructional time. It is more important now than ever before to make informed, conscious decisions about how much time and attention will be devoted to specific standards.

We will evaluating standards against a list of criteria such as:

- Does the standard have applications that cross over into other content areas?
- Is the standard a prerequisite for future learning?
- Those standards that don't make the cut are not eliminated; they simply are not focused upon with the same level of intensity

2. Diagnosing Essential Missed Learning:

If we don't know which concepts and skills students are missing, how can we possibly provide the

kind of targeted instruction needed to bridge those gaps? The annual high stakes test most students take isn't likely to yield the kind of information that will help in this regard. Instead, ongoing progress monitoring is the key to uncovering areas of need that can then be addressed.

3. Utilizing Interdependent Collaborative Student Teams:

St. Augustine High School will continue to have Kagan Strategies that will allow students to help each other grow.

Many classrooms and schools have achieved powerful results when students work in academic teams to tackle rigorous standards-based tasks.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities are going to be implemented monthly at St. Augustine High School by our administrative team for the faculty. In addition to the monthly trainings we have several scheduled trainings from the district level where teachers are able to choose specific topics that will better suit their instructional needs.

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 ensure best practices are being utilized within the classroom. New teachers work with their PLC team to develop lesson plans and analyze common summative and formative assessments. The inclusion of the PLC process allows new teachers to feel supported through the team and ensure they have support.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. Building Commitment:

Without buy in for the current strategies, there would be no sustainability from one year to the next. Therefore an emphasis on building commitment with the current staff is the first step towards improvements for the future.

In order to do this we will need to provide rationale for change, solicit and use teacher input continuously, select an effective improvement measure and make change as transparent as possible.

2. Developing Capacity:

Cultivating collaboration and shared responsibility amongst the staff will allow for meaningful collaboration has been identified as a way to foster capacity building. Once new abilities develop, we will need to encourage teacher leadership. Teachers became more invested can grow as leaders.

3. Increasing Staff Retention:

In order to maintain the investment that was made with teacher commitment and development we need to do everything that we can to ensure that that human capital investment stays within our school. A few services that SAHS can do to ensure teacher retention could be: Survey school staff members as to why they leave and why they stay and Regularly monitor teacher needs and accordingly prioritize human resource efforts.

For teachers leaving St. Augustine High School we still want to ensure that there is a record of the progress that was made within each teachers PLC teams. Materials, best strategies and data will all be monitored and documented to allow future teachers to have a record to utilize in future classrooms for continued instructional and academic growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: St. Augustine High School will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in reading and writing. The data for the English Language Arts lowest 25% showed the minimal growth for students and the school score is below the district average. Reading and writing are pillars for all classes and improving these scores will aide students in other state tests, such as the Biology and United States History state assessments.

Measureable Outcome: St. Augustine High School had down from 42% of the lowest quartile of students achieve learning gains in English Language Arts. The goal is to increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile from 38% to 48% during the 2021-2022 school year. Additionally, St. Augustine High School has a goal to increase the learning gains for all students in the school from 58% to 60%.

Monitoring: St. Augustine High School will be monitoring the progress in a variety of different ways. We will be monitoring teacher progress in implementing reading strategies through normal classroom observations in addition to documentation within the teachers PLC groups.

Students growth will be monitored throughout the year as well through the PLC groups and by our Instructional Literacy Coach Danielle Woodall.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Danielle Woodall (danielle.woodall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC teams are formed to encourage teacher collaboration to ensure best practices in the classroom. The English and Reading teachers will focus on the key standards for each unit, develop common summative assessments, and compare data from the common summative tests to ensure that students are mastering the standards. The reading classes will use the computer program, Achieve3000, to provide explicit and targeted instruction for students in the lowest quartile. Additionally, the Literacy Leadership Team will have monthly meetings to discuss strategies for including reading and writing instruction in all content area classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The PLC teams will be able to identify strategies that are most effective for each standard and analyze data collaboratively to best address the needs of their students. The teachers will use the data from the common assessments analyzed during PLC meetings to scaffold instruction and provide remediation through small group instruction. St. Augustine High School is following the Dufour model for the PLC process 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 the team 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 Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data, St. Augustine High School plans to focus on improving the math learning gains for the lowest 25% of students. The scores from the previous school year was below the district average. As a school, we would like to focus on ensuring the lowest 25% of students are proficient in math.

Measureable Outcome: St. Augustine High School has set a goal of increasing the math learning gains of the lowest 25% from 48% in 2019 school year to 55% during the current school year.

Monitoring: St. Augustine High School will be monitoring the progress Math learning gains of different ways. We will be monitoring teacher progress in implementing Kagan strategies and utilization of technology within the classroom through normal classroom observations in addition to documentation within the teachers PLC groups.

Students growth will be monitored throughout the year as well through the PLC groups and by our Instructional Math coach Ashley Zapata

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Zapata (ashley.zapata@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 collaborative PLC groups. While in these groups, teachers are developing common assessments 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 mastered.

We are also continuing to have a 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 lowest 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 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 standards. The strategies incorporate student’s involvement and require students 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 the team 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 Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Graduation is one of the primary goals of the education system and improving the number of students that graduate on time is always a focus of 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. During the previous school year, 19.6% of the students at St. Augustine High School had attendance below 90%. Additionally, 12.7% of the students had one or more suspensions throughout the school year. Students missing school takes time away from their learning and can negatively impact their learning gains on the state assessments. Focusing on ensuring students are at school and remain in school can improve not only our attendance and discipline but student proficiency in reading and math.

Measureable Outcome:

St. Augustine High School is setting a goal to increase the graduation rate from 87% to 90% for students that graduate on time. This long-term goal is one that St. Augustine High School continues to work towards annually.

Monitoring:

RTI and MTSS teams will be identifying and then monitoring students that are either at risk for academic or behavior reasons, then collecting data on the individual students to ensure progress before removal of the program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trevor Abbs (trevor.abbs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increasing the graduation rate is linked to increasing the attendance at St. Augustine High School. In order to keep students on track for graduation, St. Augustine High school has implemented two mentoring programs, the Shine program and the LINK Crew program. Within the LINK Crew program, incoming freshman are assigned a student mentor to provide support and motivation throughout their freshman year. The program monitors the transition for students from middle to high school.

St. Augustine High School has also implemented the Shine mentoring program. Through this program at-risk students, primarily seniors, are assigned a mentor through the leadership team. The mentor monitors the student's progress throughout the school year and provides motivation to meet the graduation requirements.

Additionally, each quarter we recognize and celebrate students who are improving their attendance and behavior with our Jacket Up incentive program.

We are also utilizing our RTI/MTSS to identify at risk students and conduct restorative practices to help assist these students in making appropriate behavior and academic decisions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Identification of students that are at risk is the first step in focusing targeted interventions to increase student success. Studies show that students who have a strong role model tend to find more academic success, increased attendance, and decreased behavior incidents. Our mentoring programs aim to support students in need of guidance as well as encourage positive behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that are at risk by analyzing school-wide reports.
2. The MTSS team meets weekly to discuss SIP goals, core instruction, resource allocation, teacher support systems, and small group needs. Students needing individual student focused meetings are identified weekly and meetings are scheduled.
3. The Jacket Up Program is an incentive program that will highlight students that are doing well in school. Students will be rewarded and recognized for improvement in attendance and behavior.
4. The goals of Jacket Swarm and the Link Crew are to encourage students to get involved in extracurricular activities.

Person Responsible Trevor Abbs (trevor.abbs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discipline data has been on a downward slope, but has remained consistent at St. Augustine High School for the last several years. The areas that will be focused on for the upcoming school year is going to be focused on the number of suspensions and reducing the violent incidents.

Many of the suspensions occur within the same group of students. In an effort to improve the behavior of these individuals St. Augustine High School will have tiered levels of intervention from our Response to Intervention team. Students that have been identified as needing extra help are mentored by the team and monitored where data is collected showing both academic and behavior improvements.

Another larger focus is to create a single school culture this school year where students will feel that they belong. All students will be encouraged to join a club, sport, or some other extracurricular activity with the anticipation that students that want to be at school will be more successful academically and behaviorally.

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.

All incoming 9th grade students will be enrolled in the Jacket 101 course which focuses on supporting students as they adjust from middle school to high school.

St. Augustine High School is also using the Jacket-Up incentive program as an established way for teachers to highlight students who have demonstrated improvement in any area. The Jacket Up program provides monthly and quarterly awards that focus on creating a positive culture and learning environment. Community partners such as Zaxby's, Mellow Mushroom, and our PTO provide support through incentives and financial support for the program.

Students at St. Augustine High School are encouraged to enroll in Career Academies or Programs of Choice. St Augustine High School offers The Aviation and Aerospace Academy, The Academy of Future Teachers, The Academy of Law and Homeland Security, Army Junior ROTC, and the St Johns County Center for the Arts. These programs prepare students for the workforce, as well as provide them a strong sense of community during high school. These students proudly wear their academy shirts or uniforms on certain days of the week, participate in extracurricular clubs or student organizations related to their program, and learn through real-world projects and experiences.

The Jacket-Up incentive program also includes a team of students called the Jacket-Up SWARM who help plan events throughout the school year. These events focus on celebrating their peers as well as increasing school morale and encouraging all students to be involved. The students in Jacket-Up SWARM strive to make a positive influence on their school and peers.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Susan Stauble is the leader of Link Crew leaders and the Swarm. She facilitates the student mentorship program and student school involvement for events throughout St. Augustine High School.

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.

Robert Raimann is the Career and Program Specialist at St. Augustine High School. He showcases our academies at recruitment events for middle and high school students. He encourages students to take part in our offered programs by visiting classrooms and building positive relationships. He also consistently

monitors academic performance, behavior, and attendance of all academy students. Providing these students with support and giving them meaningful feedback helps to increase program completion rates. Mr. Raimann works to increase the number of industry certification opportunities offered at St Augustine High School, helping our graduates to become strong candidates for future employers.

Trevor Abbs is the leader of the deans for our restorative practices at St. Augustine High School. He monitors at risk students, guides them to the correct behaviors, and has positive reinforcements procedures that aim to redirect student behavior.