St. Augustine Public Montessori School (Sapms)

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Augustine Public Montessori School (Sapms)

7A WILLIAMS ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www.staugustinemontessori.com

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)
Elementary School KG-6	No	0%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	18%

School Grades History

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

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.

The St. Augustine Public Montessori School mission is to provide students with a learning culture grounded in Montessori philosophy and practice that inspires a love of learning and respect for self, others and the environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is of a thriving, financially stable, authentic Montessori school whereby students are encouraged to see new challenges, explore their abilities, and satisfy innate curiosity. They are inspired towards deep questioning and peaceful action and fostered towards self-expression in a supportive environment that values critical thinking and strength of a diverse community. The school integrates academic and social experiences in an environment of civility and trust.

Children are encouraged to learn through physical exploration of their environment, repeating activities until achieving mastery. Teachers tailor the available activities according to the observed developmental needs of each child, with the result that each child remains focused and engaged in individual and group activities of their own developmental level and experience the freedom to progress at their individual pace. Instruction through scientific and practical learning and the arts provides relevant skills to meet the world with compassion and a sense of responsibility.

The Montessori Method fosters a lifelong commitment to society. Each student develops critical thinking skills to meet shared community goals and through collaborative problem-solving, an uncompromising respect for self, others, and the environment. An emphasis on inner discipline and encouragement to self-identify errors from the instructional materials promotes the development of confident, well-adjusted people ready to take their places as capable, informed leaders and meaningful contributors in an adult world.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Schirard, Kelsey	Principal
Wages, Sandi	Teacher, K-12
DeLeon, deAnne	Teacher, PreK
Myer, Janet	Teacher, ESE

Duties

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

The team members meet to review data and assess progress toward goals. Deficits are identified and addressed to ensure grade level proficiency. Information is shared in staff meetings.

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	1	8	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	15	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	15	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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 fifth grade ELA and Science performed the lowest and this is not a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The fifth grade science declined from 57% to 33%.

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

The largest gaps are in 5th grade math where the gap is 28%. Next is the 4th grade math which is a 18% gap.

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

The most improvement was shown in the math achievement which went from 35% to 50% and learning 44% to 62%,

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

Math support in small groups for all students who scored a 1 or 2 on the FSA,
Understanding the alignment of Montessori Curriculum and Florida Standards

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	72%	72%	56%	71%	68%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	55%	57%	59%	52%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	50%	48%	0%	53%	46%
Math Achievement	50%	77%	62%	41%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	62%	67%	59%	48%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	47%	0%	60%	46%
Science Achievement	33%	68%	55%	46%	66%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	0 (1)	22 (1)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (8)	2 (15)	6 (11)	5 (3)	13 (37)

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	80%	78%	2%	57%	23%
	2017	74%	80%	-6%	58%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
	2017	50%	74%	-24%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2018	53%	73%	-20%	55%	-2%
	2017	73%	75%	-2%	53%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2018	80%	71%	9%	52%	28%
	2017	0%	73%	-73%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	65%	80%	-15%	62%	3%
	2017	47%	80%	-33%	62%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	44%	83%	-39%	62%	-18%
	2017	19%	82%	-63%	64%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2018	33%	79%	-46%	61%	-28%
	2017	20%	80%	-60%	57%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
06	2018	60%	73%	-13%	52%	8%
	2017	0%	73%	-73%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		60%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	33%	73%	-40%	55%	-22%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

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	36			9							
WHT	71	59		50	59		25				
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	25			9							
WHT	71	61		35	43		58				

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	
Rationale	
Intended Outcome	
Point Person	[no one identified]
Action Step	
Description	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Activity #2	
Title	ELA/Science
Rationale	The 5th grade ELA data shows a 20% gap as compared to the district and a 35% gap in Science.
Intended Outcome	To meet the district average in achievement for ELA and Science over the course of two years.
Point Person	Sandi Wages (sandi@staugustinemontessori.com)
Action Step	
Description	By combining the curriculum for ELA and Science using novels centered around the integration of scientific terms and concepts, students will be able to comprehend and synthesis the interconnection of science and daily life.
Person Responsible	Sandi Wages (sandi@staugustinemontessori.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly curriculum meetings to plan lessons that incorporate both Common Core ELA and NGSS Science standards.
Person Responsible	Sandi Wages (sandi@staugustinemontessori.com)

Activity #3	
Title	Math
Rationale	Even though we made gains in the math we would like to continue with these gains.
Intended Outcome	To match the district's math average achievement percentage within two years.
Point Person	Sandi Wages (sandi@staugustinemontessori.com)
Action Step	
Description	Using both iReady and Singapore Math word problem strategies, we will strengthen the students abilities to decode and solve multi-step word problems.
Person Responsible	Sandi Wages (sandi@staugustinemontessori.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly curriculum meetings to plan lessons that incorporate both Common Core Math standards.
Person Responsible	Sandi Wages (sandi@staugustinemontessori.com)

Activity #4	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our attendance is below 90% which is not acceptable to our school community.
Intended Outcome	To raise our attendance to over 90%.
Point Person	Nisha Shah (nisha.shah@staugustinemontessori.com)
Action Step	
Description	To raise our school community awareness of the importance and negative effects of poor attendance and tardies.
Person Responsible	Nisha Shah (nisha.shah@staugustinemontessori.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly reports Community Meetings Newsletters Emails and Remind App
Person Responsible	Nisha Shah (nisha.shah@staugustinemontessori.com)