St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Augustine High School

3205 VARELLA AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

Demographics

Principal: Travis Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	B

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.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Graham, DeArmas	Principal	
Wimpelberg, Ashley	Registrar	
Davis, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Lee, Jill	Assistant Principal	
Gaynor, Sherry	Other	
Hazel, Mike	Other	
Lipovetsky, Serge	Other	
Naughton, Heather	Other	
Wallner, John	Dean	
King, Wayne	Other	
Arnow, Amy	Dean	
Cortes, Ruth	Dean	

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	0	0	0	490	444	395	367	1696
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	109	151	99	439
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	86	72	41	284
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	70	55	17	175
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	50	31	32	217

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	0	0	0	80	81	79	39	279

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	21	23	18	0	62
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	7	6	33

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

86

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

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	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 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	0	0	0	90	87	83	61	321

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	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 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	0	0	0	90	87	83	61	321

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	65%	74%	56%	58%	73%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	60%	51%	51%	59%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	42%	39%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	58%	73%	51%	53%	69%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	58%	48%	48%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	45%	32%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	88%	86%	68%	74%	84%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	88%	73%	80%	86%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	490 (0)	444 (0)	395 (0)	367 (0)	1696 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	80 (87)	109 (100)	151 (118)	99 (117)	439 (422)
One or more suspensions	85 (85)	86 (75)	72 (69)	41 (47)	284 (276)
Course failure in ELA or Math	33 (48)	70 (75)	55 (81)	17 (57)	175 (261)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	104 (125)	50 (59)	31 (43)	32 (35)	217 (262)

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
09	2019	65%	75%	-10%	55%	10%
	2018	63%	74%	-11%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	68%	74%	-6%	53%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	76%	-12%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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
2019	90%	87%	3%	67%	23%
2018	74%	84%	-10%	65%	9%
Compare		16%			

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	88%	-2%	70%	16%
2018	81%	87%	-6%	68%	13%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	79%	-40%	61%	-22%
2018	50%	79%	-29%	62%	-12%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	81%	-6%	57%	18%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	64%	77%	-13%	56%	8%
Compare		11%			

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	29	39	31	28	35	29	64	56		82	29
ASN	85	77									
BLK	35	47	37	32	45	46	71	61		77	43
HSP	65	46	33	69	66	40	93	78		85	67
MUL	50	61		61	53		73				
WHT	71	60	45	64	57	51	90	89		89	70
FRL	46	49	39	43	48	36	81	72		77	48

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

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	65

ESSA Federal Index	
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	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	54
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.

The data component that performed the lowest was the English Language Arts lowest 25 percentile. This category had 42% receive learning gains compared to the state average of 42%. This has been a low data component score for the last three years and has improved from 2018 years 38% proficiency.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline was the Math Achievement which declined from 59% to 58%. This decline could be within the margin of error for fluctuation from year to year. In the other two categories for math: learning gains and learning gains within the lowest 25% we showed improvement. This indicates that we should have improved in overall math achievement. One reason that we did not improve in this area is that the students entered at a lower level, were able to improve, just not enough to show mastery in the topic.

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.

We were able to close the achievement gap in all of the categories compared to the state. We were able to score higher than or match the state in every category. The two areas that were the closest to the state average were English Language Arts and Math Learning gains for the lowest quartile. The improvement in this are could be due to an increased focus on the lowest 25% as well as the implementation of a remediation period to focus on areas were students need improvement. In previous years we have fallen below the state average and or matched these categories.

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

The area that showed the most improvement is the Science achievement. This increased from 75% to 88%. The Science department has historically performed well. The increase in Science achievement could be a result of the remediation period. The Science department also participates in an active PLC group where they share best practices and other teaching strategies to improve student achievement.

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

An area that is of potential concern is the the number of students that display two or more early warning indicators; especially in the 9th and 10th grade. The amount of students that arrive at St. Augustine High School and receive a level one score is high compared to all of the other grade levels. The amount of students displaying more than one indicator to be at risk is also higher in the lower grade levels.

Another area that is of concern is the increased amount of attendance issues as students progress to higher grade levels.

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

1. Graduation Rate
2. Math Learning Gains
3. English Language Arts Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Last year St. Augustine High School showed that 42% 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 58% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Danielle Macclary (danielle.macclary@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	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. Literacy Leadership team having bi-weekly discussions involving scaffolding up to the January/February writing task. ACHIEVE 3000 program will also be used for Intensive Reading and select ELA/Social Studies courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The PLC groups will be able to identify strategies that are most effective; being able to analyze more data collaboratively than with one teacher alone. The scaffolding developed at these meetings will be adjusted based off of the results from the common summative assessments data from the PLC groups. We are following the Dufour model for the PLC which has shown success in many of the schools that have implemented the PLC programs correctly.
Action Step	
Description	Within the PLCs from each subject teams will: 1. Analyze data from district and state assessments. 2. Develop a Smart goal of which standards are key for each course. 3. Establish the best practices and methods to teach the most important material as well as develop common summative assessments. 4. Share common assessment data to identify where students succeeded or did not reach desired achievement. 5. Develop a plan for what to do when students do not master the material.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	SAHS will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in math
Rationale	Students in the lowest 25% although it did show improvement had low proficiency rates on the Algebra 1 Florida Standards Assessment. This category improved during 2018-2019 school year and still continues to be the focus at St. Augustine High School.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	St. Augustine High School has set a goal of increasing the learning gains in the lowest 25% from 48% in 2018-2019 to 60% during the current 2019-2020 school year. We improved from 42% to 48% for the 2018-2019 school year. For the 2019-2020 school year we will continue to work towards our goal of 60% learning gains for the lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jenna Yow (jenna.yow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will 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. 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have seen success with these strategies last year. Through the PLC process we should expect to see learning gains as we identify specific student needs. AVID and Kagan strategies have shown to increase student interest and learning. The math standards require students to show a deep understanding and application of the math. The strategies used will incorporate students having to work with the math; replacing the work on the math problem mentality and therefore increasing proficiency on the standards.
Action Step	
Description	Within the PLCs from each subject teams will: 1. Analyze data from district and state assessments. 2. Develop a Smart goal of which standards are key for each course. 3. Establish the best practices and methods to teach the most important material as well as develop common summative assessments. 4. Share common assessment data to identify where students succeeded or did not reach desired achievement. 5. Develop a plan for what to do when students do not master the material.
Person Responsible	Jenna Yow (jenna.yow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	SAHS will increase the percentage of students that graduate
Rationale	Graduation is one of the primary goals of the education system. Improving the amount of students that graduate on time is always a focus at St. Augustine High School. While focusing on improving graduation St. Augustine High School will also be able to address and focus on several other key areas such as attendance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	St. Augustine High School is setting a goal to increase the graduation rate from 87% to 90% of students who graduate on time. This long term goal is one that St. Augustine High School continues to work towards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Arnow (aarnow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	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. 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 continuing the remediation period. During this period teachers are working with students and focusing on missed material.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Identification of students that are at risk is paramount to being able to help them. Studies have also shown that students that have a strong role model is linked to student academic success and behavior. The mentoring programs aim to help students that are in need of guidance as well as
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students that are at risk by running school-wide reports. a. 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. b. 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.

2. Providing time for students to learn missed information.

a. The WIN period is designated by teachers to focus on material that individual student need. This will allow time for students to take tests that they missed or failed and recover grades that are low.

3. Incentive programs and school atmosphere.

a. Jacket Up Program. St. Augustine High School has an incentive program that will highlight students that are doing well in a variety of areas in school. Students will be rewarded and recognized for items such as: being on time, doing well in class, being positive, and any other behavior that is showing that the student is growing as an pupil.

b. Jacket Swarm and Link Crew. St. Augustine High School continues to encourage students to get involved in after school activities. Studies have shown that students that participate in extracurricular activities are more likely to show success in academics as well. Link Crew has student mentors that make the transition into high school for ninth graders smoother and the mentors invite students to after school activities. The Jacket Swarm primary goal is to increase school spirit and student involvement with after school activities.

Person Responsible Ruth Cortes (ruth.cortes@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).

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: SAHS will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in reading and writing.**				**$112,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3373	100-Salaries	0181 - St. Augustine High School	Other Federal	0.0	$112,000.00
			Notes: SAHS received $112,000 in SAI funds based on FTE to support our at-risk students. We are using the funds to pay for salaries for two Intensive Reading Coaches at SAHS.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: SAHS will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in math**				**$38,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2162	100-Salaries	0181 - St. Augustine High School	Other Federal		$38,000.00
			Notes: SAHS employed a Math Coach for the 2019-2020 school year to support our math teachers. Specifically, our Algebra 1 and Geometry (Lowest Quartile). The Math Coach will			

			model lessons for teachers, analyze data, attend PLC's, share effective instructional strategies, and share resources to support teachers.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: SAHS will increase the percentage of students that graduate**				**$38,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3429	100-Salaries	0181 - St. Augustine High School	Other		$38,000.00
			Notes: SAHS employs an extra Guidance Counselor and Dean of Attendance to help with the graduation rate.			
					Total:	**$188,000.00**