

St. Johns County School District

# Patriot Oaks Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Drew Chiodo**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	8%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (73%) 2014-15: A (88%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>4%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>28%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

## 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.**

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Olson, Allison	Principal	
Watson, Sandy	School Counselor	
Wetjen, Chris	Dean	
Susice, Kim	Instructional Coach	
Carlson-Bright, Dianna	Assistant Principal	
Balla, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

### 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	141	144	148	143	152	166	166	193	187	0	0	0	0	1440
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	4	1	4	5	7	16	18	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	5	11	13	22	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	14	11	8	6	0	0	0	0	45

**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	4	3	7	6	0	0	0	20

**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	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

83

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/27/2019

**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	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 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	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	16

**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	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 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	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	16

**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	85%	84%	61%	83%	84%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	67%	59%	70%	68%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	61%	54%	61%	70%	51%
Math Achievement	89%	88%	62%	87%	88%	58%
Math Learning Gains	74%	71%	59%	73%	73%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	66%	52%	71%	70%	50%
Science Achievement	77%	77%	56%	86%	79%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	95%	78%	94%	95%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	141 (0)	144 (0)	148 (0)	143 (0)	152 (0)	166 (0)	166 (0)	193 (0)	187 (0)	1440 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (1)	1 (6)	4 (9)	1 (5)	4 (6)	5 (2)	7 (5)	16 (11)	18 (7)	63 (52)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (6)	5 (2)	11 (7)	13 (17)	22 (34)	53 (68)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (1)	3 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	5 (5)	14 (14)	11 (13)	8 (8)	6 (7)	45 (48)

**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
03	2019	87%	78%	9%	58%	29%
	2018	84%	78%	6%	57%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	77%	4%	58%	23%
	2018	83%	74%	9%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	86%	76%	10%	56%	30%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	73%	5%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
	2018	83%	71%	12%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	85%	72%	13%	52%	33%
	2018	86%	70%	16%	51%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	84%	71%	13%	56%	28%
	2018	90%	76%	14%	58%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	82%	0%	62%	20%
	2018	86%	80%	6%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
	2018	90%	83%	7%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	93%	80%	13%	60%	33%
	2018	91%	79%	12%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	84%	74%	10%	55%	29%
	2018	86%	73%	13%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	92%	80%	12%	54%	38%
	2018	92%	80%	12%	54%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	83%	78%	5%	46%	37%
	2018	81%	73%	8%	45%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	73%	6%	53%	26%
	2018	77%	73%	4%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	74%	72%	2%	48%	26%
	2018	85%	75%	10%	50%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	90%	3%	71%	22%
2018	93%	89%	4%	71%	22%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%
2018	99%	79%	20%	62%	37%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
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
SWD	55	60	51	59	56	55	47	71	17		
ELL	55			45							
ASN	96	75		97	82	70	96	100	83		
BLK	61	53	36	70	61	57	58				
HSP	86	74	64	85	77	56	76	90	57		
MUL	81	76		87	86						
WHT	85	69	64	90	73	70	76	93	62		
FRL	79	74		73	78		90				
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			

**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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	684

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	79
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.**

Our lowest performance data is for SWD and ELL students in both reading and math. The trend for SWD is going up while the ELL student data is declining. Contributing factors include specific instruction on academic goals for SWD which is tight. Plans and interventions for ELL students are much looser and not showing the gains of their peers.

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

Our ELA data for our black students showed the largest decline this past year. This data is perplexing and of concern to us. We are unsure of the reasons or contributing factors but will have this as a focus for the coming year.

**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.**

Our students exceed the state averages in each data area.

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

We see the most improvement with our students with disabilities and their learning gains in ELA. We moved from 43 to 60 in the learning gains. This is a great celebration. We also went from 39 to 51 in learning gains for our lowest 25%. We attribute this to our consistent conversations regarding our lowest 25% that encompassed our SWD. They were at the forefront for teachers. They knew them by name and felt accountable for them.

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

Attendance and suspensions are areas that we see that are potential areas of concern. Both seem to grow as our kids get older. Suspensions make more sense than concerns with attendance. We talk each Core team meeting regarding our attendance concerns and meet with parents. We will continue to monitor both closely.

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

1. Math learning gains for SWD
2. Math learning gains for lowest 25%
3. Academic achievement for black students
4. Learning gains for black students
5. Academic achievement for SWD

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest Quartile achievement and learning gains, ELA
<b>Rationale</b>	We made great gains in ELA with our lowest quartile and need to keep that momentum going. We will continue that focus.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We want to see a 5 point increases in learning gains for our lowest quartile, 5 point gain in acheivement in reading.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	i-Ready ELA instructional offered in a computer lab as part of a tutoring program offered at the school.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students need individual paths for learning and filling gaps in learning. We feel this programming will provide this. We will invite all students and offer either before or after school options.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a list of possible participants</li> <li>2. Invite them</li> <li>3. Purchase the instructional i-Ready for ELA</li> <li>4. Run the tutoring program 4 days a week</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Duggan (matthew.duggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Academic Achievement and relationships for students of color
<b>Rationale</b>	Our students of color have the lowest achievement and lowest learning gains. They are part of our lowest quartile work but we need to do more. We will work on building relationships with these students using our elective team.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We want to see a 5 point gain in achievement and 5 point gain in learning gains for both reading and math. We also want to help students feel more connected to our school and staff with mentors.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	I-Ready math and reading instruction Focus on relationships with an elective teacher - mentoring
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We feel the instructional component of i-Ready, offered during a before or after school tutoring program will fill gaps and help to supplement the classroom learning. We also want to focus on stronger relationships with elective teachers to build stronger connections to school.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish mentors (elective teachers) to each student of color</li> <li>2. Invite all students to tutoring program</li> <li>3. Purchase i-Ready instructional programming</li> <li>4. Meet monthly with elective teachers to discuss their interactions with their students</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Duggan (matthew.duggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest Quartile achievement and learning gains, Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Our ELA achievement and learning gains outweighed our growth in math. We need to make math more of a priority and look for gains there for students as well.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	5 point increase in achievement and 5 point increase in learning gains for math
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	i-ready math instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	i-Ready creates an individualized instructional path for students that can help to fill gaps and supplement the learning in the classroom.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create list of students and invite them</li> <li>2. Purchase i-Ready math curriculum</li> <li>3. Run the tutoring program</li> <li>4. Monitor results and learning.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Duggan (matthew.duggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**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).**