St. Augustine High School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Augustine High School

3205 VARELLA AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-sahs.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)
High School 9-12	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	B	B	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.

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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Graham, DeArmas	Principal
Raimann, Parker	Registrar
Brown, Travis	Assistant Principal
Lee, Jill	Assistant Principal
Maltby, Katie	Other
Hazel, Mike	Other
Holland, Jeff	Other
Naughton, Heather	Other
Wallner, John	Dean
Menard, Eugene	Other
Arnow, Amy	Dean
Cortes, Ruth	Dean

Duties

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

The Leadership Team will meet every Friday at 9:30 AM to focus on executing the mission of "making every day count." Meeting agendas will include the review of academic data at grade and classroom levels to identify students who are at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks, as well as those who have reached or exceed benchmarks. Using this information, the team will identify the best use of time for professional development, support the sharing of best practices, evaluate and reflect on all practices, and provide school-wide instructional support as needed.The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

At Saint Augustine High School, we use the 4-step problem-solving model: Step 1, define, in objective and measurable terms the goal(s) to be attained, Step 2, identify possible reasons why the desired goal(s) is not being attained. Step 3, develop and implement a well-supported plan involving evidence-based strategies to attain the goal(s) Step 4, evaluate the effectiveness of the plan in

relation to stated goal.

Membership Roles:

Principal (DeArmas Graham): The principal will provided a common vision for the School Success Team by structuring the use of data-based decision-making and ensuring that the school-based team is implementing Rtl. She will also conduct assessments of Rtl skills of school staff, to ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation and adequate professional development. Regular communication with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities will take place through the school website, newsletter, and School Advisory Council meetings.

Assistant Principal: Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Coordinator Jill Lee: Jill Lee will maintain the procedural safeguards required by law with respect to students, staffing, and IEPs.

Assistant Principal: Travis Brown Curriculum: Travis Brown will provide improvement of learning opportunities through the provision of instructional leadership. Responsibilities include curriculum development, instruction, and staff development.

Registrar: Parker Raimann: Primary role is to work with Travis Brown with curriculum to ensure that students are enrolled in the appropriate classes to develop the master schedule for the school

Katie Maltby: The Career Specialist is responsible for developing, maintaining, and growing the Career Academies. She works closely with guidance and students in creating schedules that are conducive to a college track, including dual-enrollment through St. Johns River Community College.

Attendance Dean (Amy Arnow): The Dean of attendance uses several methods to promote and encourage student attendance. She works hand-in-hand with the Principal, district office, sheriff's department, and parents to monitor data collection methods.

Discipline Dean: John Wallner handles enforcement of procedures and rules at school.

Testing Coordinator: Heather Naughton- facilitates all school and state testing for the school. Ensures that students receive proper accommodations and that proctors and administrators for the test are present.

Jeff Holland: Athletic Director ensures that the athletic department is organized and that all coaches are coordinating together with school functions.

Mike Hazel: Maintenance Coordinator: Ensures that the facility is properly maintained and adheres to health and fire regulations.

Eugene Menard: Computer Specialist: Maintains technological equipment at school for students and teachers to ensure that proper instruction can take place and state tests may be delivered.

Guidance Department Chairs (Majorie Benett & Cammy Barber): Academic coursework begins and ends with Guidance Department. As department chair, she works closely with academic department chairs to schedule student's classes designed to develop successful habits. Additionally, the Guidance Department is instrumental with parent communication through the primary method of conferences, as well as the critical link of personal communication between guidance counselor and student.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	100	118	117	422
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	75	69	47	276
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	75	81	57	261
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	59	43	35	262

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	0	0	0	0	90	87	83	61	321

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	27	22	11	2	62
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	6	2	32

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	97	103	117	401
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	59	65	45	242
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	76	72	82	271
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	64	61	20	240

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	0	0	0	0	79	84	80	67	310

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	97	103	117	401
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	59	65	45	242
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	76	72	82	271
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	64	61	20	240

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	0	0	0	0	79	84	80	67	310

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?

The data component that performed the lowest was the English Language Arts lowest 25 percentile. This category had 38% receive learning gains compared to the state average of 44% This has been a low data component score for the last three years. It has not been the lowest for the last three years. The lowest 25th percentile in Math was lower in 2017 but, the math category showed significant growth in 2018.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the English Language Arts lowest 25th pecentile which dropped 1% from the previous year. It is the only category that declined from 2017.

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

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was English Language Arts lowest 25th percentile. St. Augustine High School had showed learning gains of 38% compared to the state average of 44% in 2018; a 6% gap. In 2017 the gap was only 2% with the state averaging 41% and St. Augustine High School showing 39%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Math lowest 25th percentile. In this component St. Augustine High School improved by 10% going from 32% to 42% learning gains. This is not a trend at St. Augustine High School. The 2015-2016 year had 33% show learning gains, 2016-2017 had 32% learning gains dropping 1%.

The State average for learning gains in math for the lowest 25th percentile increased during the 2017-2018 school year as well going from 39% to 45% a 6%; showing that there may be other contributing factors that may have led to the growth in this category. St. Augustine High School did close

the gap between the state average indicating that this is still an area where there was great improvement. St. Augustine High was 7% below the state in 2016-2017 and is now only 3% below the state average for the 2017-2018 school year.

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

The actions that led to the improvement in the Math learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile:

During the 2017-2018 school year there was an increase in support facilitation in Geometry classes from 2 days a week to 4 days. The support facilitator teachers were able to identify the needs of the lowest 25th percentile. Helping with tutoring, differentiation and classroom flow. The Algebra 1 teachers also received 4 days of support facilitation; which had started during the 2016-2017 school year and continued for the 2017-2018 school year.

During the 2017-2018 school year many of the lowest 25 percentile students in math were given extra time to practice math once per week during their elective class. During this time Tracy Holland gave Algebra 1 and Geometry students remediation in a small group setting of around five students.

All of the math teachers also participated in PLC groups. In these groups teachers worked together to create common assessments that aligned with the state standards. Then data was compared to see what standards were not effectively taught to the students.

St. Augustine High School also recently acquired an attendance dean: Dean Arnow. During the 2017-2018 school year she monitored at risk students attendance to ensure that students continued to come to school.

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	64%	67%	56%	54%	71%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	53%	46%	56%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	44%	39%	48%	38%
Math Achievement	59%	66%	51%	49%	68%	43%
Math Learning Gains	55%	55%	48%	47%	51%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	45%	33%	45%	38%
Science Achievement	75%	78%	67%	82%	88%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	81%	71%	78%	85%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	87 (84)	100 (97)	118 (103)	117 (117)	422 (401)
One or more suspensions	85 (73)	75 (59)	69 (65)	47 (45)	276 (242)
Course failure in ELA or Math	48 (41)	75 (76)	81 (72)	57 (82)	261 (271)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	125 (95)	59 (64)	43 (61)	35 (20)	262 (240)

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	2018	63%	74%	-11%	53%	10%
	2017	59%	74%	-15%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	64%	76%	-12%	53%	11%
	2017	59%	73%	-14%	50%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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
2018	74%	84%	-10%	65%	9%
2017	73%	86%	-13%	63%	10%
Compare	1%				
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	81%	87%	-6%	68%	13%
2017	81%	86%	-5%	67%	14%
Compare	0%				

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	50%	79%	-29%	62%	-12%
2017	54%	78%	-24%	60%	-6%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	64%	77%	-13%	56%	8%
2017	60%	78%	-18%	53%	7%
Compare		4%			

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	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
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	16	31	29	25	34	22	33	50		57	21
ASN	67	29		85	55						
BLK	32	40	34	34	43	29	49	37		77	19
HSP	57	57	31	42	41	21	69	76		96	54
MUL	44	39		53	54		60				
WHT	64	55	43	57	50	33	81	87		82	68
FRL	43	44	35	46	46	31	63	68		75	45

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	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.
Intended Outcome	Last year St. Augustine High School showed that 38% 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 56% to 58%.
Point Person	Nancy Snell (nancy.snell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	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. PLC teams will be meeting 5 times a month on Wednesday and Thursday mornings.
	Literacy Leadership team having bi-weekly discussions involving scaffolding up to the January/February writing task. The scaffolding developed during these meetings will focus the PLC groups. The scaffolding developed at these meetings will be adjusted based off of the results from the common summative assessments data from the PLC groups.
	Co-Teach model in 9th Grade Environmental Science and 10th grade World History classes with at-risk learners in the lower 25%.
	ACHIEVE 3000 program used for Intensive Reading and select ELA/Social Studies courses
Person Responsible	Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Travis Brown will collect PLC meeting forms and attendance monthly.
	We will compare the data from the common summative assessments to ensure student learning gains are being achieved monthly.
	Data from the district exams given in at the end of the first semester will be another indicator to whether students are accomplishing learning gains.
Person Responsible	Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	SAHS will increase the precentage of students who are proficient in math
Rationale	Students in the lowest 25% had the 2nd lowest percentage of students show learning gains. This category improved the most during 2017-2018 school year and still continues to be the focus at St. Augustine High School.

Intended Outcome	St. Augustine High School has set a goal of increasing the learning gains in the lowest 25% from 42% in 2017-2018 to 60% during the current 2018-2019 school year. We are also aiming to continue improvement on the Florida Standards Assessment increasing proficiency from 59% to 61%.
Point Person	Jenna Yow (jenna.yow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	St. Augustine High School uses End of Course Exams and the Florida State Assessment data to facilitate instruction. Teachers are monitoring the data from these tests to drive their instruction within the classroom. We also utilize the AVID and Kagan Strategies 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.

This year St. Augustine High School has also hired a Math Coach: Jenna Yow to assist the math teachers with instructional material, provide assistance during the PLC meetings, as well as provide individual tutoring opportunities for the lowest 25%.

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. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jenna Yow (jenna.yow@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Travis Brown will collect PLC meeting forms and attendance monthly.

We will compare the data from the common summative assessments to ensure student learning gains are being achieved monthly.

Data from the district exams given in at the end of the first semester will be another indicator to whether students are accomplishing learning gains. |
| **Person Responsible** | Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Activity #3	
Title	SAHS will increase the percentage of students that graduate
Rationale	Graduation is one of the primary goals of the education system. During the 2017-2018 school year we had a slight decrease in the percentage of students graduating. Improving the amount of students that graduate on time is always a focus at St. Augustine High School.
Intended Outcome	St. Augustine High School is setting a goal to increase the graduation rate from 80% to 82% of students who graduate on time. The goal of 82% had previously been the
Point Person	DeArmas Graham (dearmas.graham@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	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.

Weekly our school has a MTSS core team that has an agenda that discusses SIP goals, core instruction, resource allocation, teacher support systems, and small group needs. During the MTSS meetings discussions are held pertaining to individual student needs for those students not meeting grade level proficiency.

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 implemented a 30 minute WIN period 4 days a week. During this period teachers are working with students and focusing on remediation. This remediation time will allow students that have fallen behind due to absences a chance to catch up.

Guidance counselors will meet with students and teachers to enroll students that are missing a graduation course in an online APEX course prior to senior year. Guidance counselors are also meeting with students during lunch with at risk students as a check in to see if they need any assistance in completing their required courses. |
| **Person Responsible** | DeArmas Graham (dearmas.graham@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Attendance reports will be taken weekly by Amy Arnow.

APEX teachers will monitor the course progress of students weekly.

LINK crew teachers will be monitoring grades of students that are in the mentorship program twice per semester. |

Person Responsible   Amy Arnow (aarnow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Person Responsible   Amy Arnow (aarnow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)