Patriot Oaks Academy

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	4%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Committed to every student every day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Patriot Oaks, we are a community that fosters character development, independence and a lifelong love of learning.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Olson, Allison	Principal
Sierra, Mildred	School Counselor
Watson, Sandy	School Counselor
Wetjen, Chris	Dean
Susice, Kim	Instructional Coach
Carlson-Bright, Dianna	Assistant Principal
Balla, Jessica	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal- Oversees roles and responsibilities of MTSS team, PD The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.
Assistant Principal- ESE and curriculum
Assistant Principal- Facilities, RtI
Instructional Literacy Coach- Kim Susice- Teacher coaching and mentoring
Guidance Counselors- Mildred Sierra, Sandi Watson, Amber Gianotta - provide grades and attendance information; gather teacher's feedback; monitors and logs parent contact, ensures hearing and vision data are up to date.
School Psychologist- Records notes in MTSS database during meetings; takes minutes during Core team meetings; distributes minutes; sends follow up emails

School Leadership Members:
- Participate as members of the Core Team and attend core meetings
- Take part in Rti meetings and help to create Tier II and Tier III interventions
- Finalize Rti referral packets and submit to LEA
- Refer students/parents with community resources
- Participates in parent conferences as necessary
- Performs classroom observations
- Conducts guidance lessons based on specific area of need

- Provides training to staff/teachers
- Preform speech and language screenings
- Mentor students and teachers
- Track students from EWS
- Monitor mission and vision of school

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	9	5	6	2	5	11	7	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	6	2	7	17	34	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	14	13	8	7	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected
Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	7	4	5	5	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	17	10	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	5	23	17	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	16

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	7	4	5	5	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	17	10	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	5	23	17	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	16

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Our lowest performers were in ELA, lowest 25% learning gains, school-wide. We saw a significant decline in cohort achievement in 4th, 5th and 6th grades that could have contributed to this performance with our lowest 25%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Our data, school-wide, is consistent regarding achievement and learning gains. There are improvements to be had but it is consistent. We did see declines in cohort data that are concerning to us- specifically 4th grade ELA, 5th grade ELA, 6th grade ELA and 6th grade math.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

This is a celebration as our math achievement, school-wide, is 29% higher than the state! That is the biggest gap. Our school data is above the state average in every category by at least 10%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

In looking at cohort data, our biggest improvements came in our middle grades with 7th grade ELA +9%, 8th grade ELA +8%, 7th grade math +18%. We hope this is a trend as we have introduced intensive classes for both ELA and Math and have stressed the importance of the test for class placement.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

We hope this is a trend as we have introduced intensive classes for both ELA and Math and have stressed the importance of the test for class placement.
We continue to offer intensive math and reading this year with even smaller class sizes in hopes of continual improvement.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	84%	72%	60%	82%	77%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	62%	57%	68%	63%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	62%	52%	50%	55%	49%
Math Achievement	90%	76%	61%	84%	79%	56%
Math Learning Gains	71%	65%	58%	63%	65%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	68%	52%	55%	70%	48%
Science Achievement	81%	73%	57%	84%	81%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	85%	77%	96%	92%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (1)	6 (12)	9 (7)	5 (4)	6 (5)	2 (5)	5 (9)	11 (9)	7 (13)	52 (65)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	6 (0)	2 (5)	7 (5)	17 (17)	34 (10)	68 (38)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	5 (6)	14 (16)	13 (5)	8 (23)	7 (17)	48 (67)

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
03	2018	84%	78%	6%	57%	27%
	2017	89%	80%	9%	58%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	83%	74%	9%	56%	27%
	2017	79%	74%	5%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2018	78%	73%	5%	55%	23%
	2017	89%	75%	14%	53%	36%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2018	83%	71%	12%	52%	31%
	2017	77%	73%	4%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2018	86%	70%	16%	51%	35%
	2017	82%	74%	8%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2018	90%	76%	14%	58%	32%
	2017	85%	74%	11%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	86%	80%	6%	62%	24%
	2017	94%	80%	14%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	90%	83%	7%	62%	28%
	2017	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2018	91%	79%	12%	61%	30%
	2017	97%	80%	17%	57%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2018	86%	73%	13%	52%	34%
	2017	74%	73%	1%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
07	2018	92%	80%	12%	54%	38%
	2017	84%	80%	4%	53%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2018	81%	73%	8%	45%	36%
	2017	83%	75%	8%	46%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	77%	73%	4%	55%	22%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	85%	75%	10%	50%	35%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		85%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	93%	89%	4%	71%	22%
2017	94%	90%	4%	69%	25%
Compare		-1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	99%	79%	20%	62%	37%
2017	94%	78%	16%	60%	34%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
2017	100%	78%	22%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	45	43	39	61	60	58	39	80	18		
ELL	67	73		83	85						
ASN	96	84		99	82	90	89	100	100		
BLK	74	67	50	70	64	44	64				
HSP	83	67	64	85	73	69	62	93	69		
MUL	73	63	70	83	54						
WHT	83	67	62	91	71	71	84	93	74		
FRL	75	60	56	81	63	65	76	88	86		

2017 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	38	48	49	58	56	44	55	67			
ASN	93	82		96	81		96	100	100		
BLK	78	77	67	80	86	83	81	80			
HSP	80	65	59	82	76	75	81	78			
MUL	64	47		82	84						
WHT	83	69	63	87	71	69	86	96	71		
FRL	70	76	73	65	67	53	50	92			

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	ELA learning gains lowest 25%
Rationale	As a school district, we have been charged with a focus on the learning gains for our lowest 25 %. As a school, this is our lowest area as well. We will be more purposeful in knowing exactly who those students are and intentional in our differentiated instruction for them.
Intended Outcome	We want our learning gains for our lowest 25% in ELA to improve by at least 2%.
Point Person	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	We will create a master schedule that has a targeted intervention time for all elementary grades where we plan purposeful instruction for all students but specifically for our lowest 25%. We will progress monitor 3x per year with i-Ready to see progress. For middle school, we will place students who did not show proficiency in our intensive reading class for specific and targeted instruction.
Person Responsible	Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	i-Ready 3x per year for all lowest 25%
Person Responsible	Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Math learning gains lowest 25%
Rationale	As a school district, we have been charged with a focus on the learning gains for our lowest 25 %. As a school, this is an area where we need to improve as well. We will be more purposeful in knowing exactly who those students are and intentional in our differentiated instruction for them.
Intended Outcome	We want our learning gains for our lowest 25% in Math to improve by at least 2%.
Point Person	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	We will create a master schedule that allows for pull-out targeted intervention time for math specifically for our lowest 25%. We will progress monitor 3x per year with i-Ready to see progress. For middle school, we will place students who did not show proficiency in our intensive math classes for specific and targeted instruction.
Person Responsible	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	i-Ready 3x a year Think through Math
Person Responsible	Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Mental Health integration and services
Rationale	The new state law has determined that all students now need to have quick access to mental health services. We will establish systems at Patriot Oaks that will identify students with needs and get them the services that can help them be successful.
Intended Outcome	Our Core team meeting notes will show that we discuss students specifically and frequently with the goal of getting them services in a timely manner.
Point Person	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Our core team will now meet weekly with an agenda of students to discuss. We will have a focused part of our agenda for mental health services. We will utilize our school counselors as well as our social worker and district mental health professional to set up groups and service students based on need.
Person Responsible	Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	As we provide services to students, our hope would be to see fewer students referred for mental health services. We would also hope to see less need for repeated interventions for an individual student because we have helped enough with strategies or have helped process through struggles.
Person Responsible	Sandy Watson (sandy.watson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$2,000.00**