St. Johns County School District

Gaines Alternative At Hamblen

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gaines Alternative At Hamblen

1 CHRISTOPHER ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

www-gats.stjohns.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Craig Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 5-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Table of Contents

Gaines Alternative At Hamblen

1 CHRISTOPHER ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

www-gats.stjohns.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 5-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	I

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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 Gaines Alternative School provides an alternative to expulsion through temporary removal of students for Level Four infractions of the St. Johns County School District's Student Code of Conduct. Gaines also serves students awaiting adjudication of off-campus felonies by continuing academic instruction and providing therapeutic support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Gaines Alternative School will provide an academically sound, physically safe, and therapeutically supportive learning environment for students who have committed Level Four infractions of the St. Johns County School District's Student Code of Conduct and for students who are awaiting adjudication of off-campus felonies.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMahon, Patricia	Principal	
Davis, Craig	Assistant Principal	
Padgett, James	Teacher, ESE	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	17	21	17	13	0	83
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	14	11	10	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	16	19	16	11	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	9	6	6	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	6	3	1	0	19

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	5	5	14	14	13	10	0	61

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	5	4	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	6	3	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	2	0	2	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	0	2	9

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	1	1	0	5	7	5	4	23

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	5	4	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	6	3	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	2	0	2	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	0	2	9

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	1	1	0	5	7	5	4	23

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	74%	56%	0%	73%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	51%	0%	59%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	50%	42%	0%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	73%	51%	0%	69%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	48%	0%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	86%	68%	0%	84%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	88%	73%	0%	86%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	8 (0)	7 (0)	17 (0)	21 (0)	17 (0)	13 (0)	0 (0)	83 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	4 (1)	4 (1)	13 (0)	14 (5)	11 (5)	10 (5)	0 (4)	56 (21)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	8 (1)	6 (1)	16 (0)	19 (5)	16 (8)	11 (6)	0 (3)	76 (24)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (1)	3 (1)	7 (0)	9 (4)	6 (2)	6 (0)	0 (2)	36 (10)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	3 (1)	1 (1)	5 (0)	6 (2)	3 (3)	1 (0)	0 (2)	19 (9)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	0%	74%	-74%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	72%	-72%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	70%	-70%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	71%	-71%	56%	-56%
	2018	33%	76%	-43%	58%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	30%	75%	-45%	55%	-25%
	2018	0%	74%	-74%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
10	2019	25%	74%	-49%	53%	-28%
	2018	10%	76%	-66%	53%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	0%	74%	-74%	55%	-55%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	45%	78%	-33%	46%	-1%
	2018	30%	73%	-43%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	45%	72%	-27%	48%	-3%
	2018	45%	75%	-30%	50%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		45%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	87%	-87%	67%	-67%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	84%	-84%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	90%	-90%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	89%	-89%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	88%	-88%	70%	-70%
2018	73%	87%	-14%	68%	5%
Compare		-73%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	79%	-37%	61%	-19%
2018	55%	79%	-24%	62%	-7%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	81%	-81%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	77%	-77%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT											
FRL											
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
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

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	0
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Analysis of the subgroups indicates similar percentages of learning gains in ELA and math. However, due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 90% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

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

Analysis of the subgroups indicate similar percentages of learning gains in ELA and math. However, due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 90% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Both ELA and math data indicate gaps when compared to state data. However, due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 90% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

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

Significant improvement is not indicated by the comparison data. However, due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 90% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Per the EWS data, student attendance emerges as an area of concern.

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

1. Student attendance
2. Student academic progress
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	School Culture
Rationale	A key component of fostering student success is the quality of the school's culture. In order to strengthen the culture of the Gaines Alternative School, we will design student focus groups, facilitated by the school instructional behavior interventionist, who will address attendance, senior graduation readiness, mental health issues, and safety.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To address ESSA data, senior graduation readiness will be tracked as will student engagement with / completion of the focus group process, as described above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Gaines Alternative School will conduct student focus groups, facilitated by the school instructional behavior interventionist, who will address attendance, senior graduation readiness, mental health issues, and safety.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The focus group process will strengthen our efforts to meet student needs, thereby improving attendance and academic performance. To address ESSA data that indicate a low graduation rate, a senior graduation readiness group will be formed to assist seniors in preparation for graduation as they return to their regular school.
Action Step	
Description	1. The instructional behavior interventionist will conduct focus group sessions as described above. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Performance
Rationale	Students' academic progress should continue while they are assigned to Gaines Alternative School to make transitioning back to the home-zone school successful.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers will continually monitor student progress in math, providing support as needed and providing weekly progress reports to parents. Entry and withdrawal grades will be used to gauge success as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Gaines team will function as a professional learning community, meeting weekly to troubleshoot student performance concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The Gaines team will function as a PLC to foster student progress. 2. Remediation will be provided as needed. 3. Weekly progress reports will be sent to parents. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	English Language Arts Performance
Rationale	Students' academic progress should continue while they are assigned to Gaines Alternative School to make transitioning back to the home-zone school successful.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers will continually monitor student progress in math, providing support as needed and providing weekly progress reports to parents. Entry and withdrawal grades will be used to gauge success as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Gaines team will function as a professional learning community, meeting weekly to troubleshoot student performance concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The Gaines team will function as a PLC to foster student progress. 2. Remediation will be provided as needed. 3. Weekly progress reports will be sent to parents. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

The professional learning community model will serve as a foundation for our efforts to ensure a sound instructional and behavioral program.