

St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine Public Montessori School (Sapms)



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	14

St. Augustine Public Montessori School (Sapms)

7A WILLIAMS ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www.staugustinemontessori.com>

Demographics

Principal: Diane Dodds

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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)	6%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	14

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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. Montessori teachers tailor work 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. 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeLeon, deAnne	Principal	
McDowell, Jean	Assistant Principal	
Price, Ben	Teacher, K-12	
Castle, Robin	Teacher, ESE	
Myer, Janet	Teacher, K-12	
Shah, Nisha	Teacher, K-12	

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	14	14	26	28	19	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	4	9	5	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/18/2019

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	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 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	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 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	73%	75%	57%	69%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	67%	58%	61%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	59%	53%	0%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	77%	63%	35%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	69%	62%	44%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	59%	51%	0%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	72%	53%	57%	69%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	14 (0)	14 (0)	26 (0)	28 (0)	19 (0)	15 (0)	11 (0)	127 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (1)	2 (1)	0 (8)	4 (5)	9 (5)	5 (2)	0 (0)	22 (22)
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)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	3 (6)	0 (5)	5 (13)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	80%	78%	2%	58%	22%
	2018	80%	78%	2%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	77%	-6%	58%	13%
	2018	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	71%	76%	-5%	56%	15%
	2018	53%	73%	-20%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	0%	74%	-74%	54%	-54%
	2018	80%	71%	9%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-80%				
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	36%	82%	-46%	62%	-26%
	2018	65%	80%	-15%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	82%	-19%	64%	-1%
	2018	44%	83%	-39%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	36%	80%	-44%	60%	-24%
	2018	33%	79%	-46%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	0%	74%	-74%	55%	-55%
	2018	60%	73%	-13%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	73%	-16%	53%	4%
	2018	33%	73%	-40%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	36										
WHT	71	45		48	50		58				
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				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	274
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

English Language Learners	
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	54
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

Math achievement was the lowest test score performance measure for this past year. Several programmatic and staffing changes occurred mid-year that potentially affected test performance but it was an isolated occurrence from which trends cannot be gleaned.

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

Math achievement showed the greatest decline. Several programmatic and staffing changes occurred mid-year that potentially affected test performance but it was an isolated occurrence from which trends cannot be gleaned. Discontinued use of Montessori correlation tools to track students practice with standards may have contributed to some declines over the past several years.

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.

Again, the Math and science achievements show the greatest gaps. Although not dramatic gaps, Montessori students should out-perform state averages in these areas according to national studies. However, our school has suffered from instability in administrative and instructional leadership over the past year and Montessori curriculum has not been the emphasis.

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

Science achievement shows the greatest improvement over the past year, but again, the Montessori science curriculum covers more concepts and goes beyond the standards and should result higher test results. However, the focus of our science work is not to prioritize testing and therefore the knowledge and abilities gained may not be reflected in testing, especially with science.

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

We only have one student with two early warning indicators. There are 22 students with less than 90% participation at school. We consistently list attendance as a potential area of concern and that continues. Parent education emphasis on the importance of attendance has already been increased this year.

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

1. Return to Montessori method, philosophy and curriculum as emphasis of entire program.
2. Maintain financial stability.
3. Align Montessori implementation and practice both vertically and horizontally, using Montessori Compass to track lessons and correlation with standards.
4. Emphasize Montessori tools and training for teachers when working with students with learning differences.
5. Implement increased Montessori parent education activities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Montessori Implementation and Practice
Rationale	Montessori cannot be done piecemeal. It is a total curriculum approach that is integrated and sequential. Full benefits can be achieved only if the dynamic of the total program is understood by a Montessori-trained teaching staff that shares a common educational philosophy. Montessori programming should be implemented in its entirety with minimal interruption from auxiliary classes or services.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Meet 20% greater number of criteria required by the American Montessori Society accreditation standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jean McDowell (jean@staugustinemontessori.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Montessori Compass will be reinstated as a tracking tool to track and analyze the implementation of Montessori with vertical and horizontal alignment school-wide, correlation with state/federal standards and identification of coverage and gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Montessori Compass provides the correlation of the integrated Montessori Curriculum with state and federal standards and can be used to help teachers and administration coordinate and learn from one another as they practice Montessori.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train Montessori-credentialed teachers to utilize Montessori Compass as a way to track vertical and horizontal alignment. 2. Utilize Montessori consultants for facilitating consistent utilization and understanding of Montessori Materials, the interdisciplinary spiral Elementary curriculum and working with children with learning differences. 3. Reinstate strong parent education program strengthening the home-school connection. 4. Support Montessori teachers to trust the Montessori curriculum and align assessment techniques without increased emphasis on standardized testing.
Person Responsible	deAnne DeLeon (deanne.deleon@staugustinemontessori.com)

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).

Maintenance of financial stability will be accomplished through the following:

- Utilization of consistent communication among financial team: Director, Treasurer, Accountant, Board and Staff to review and scrutinize monthly financials and adhere to policies.
- Reinstate, make revisions and updates as needed to school procedures and policies at the administrative and board levels to ensure consistency, compliance and efficiency.
- Develop strong fundraising team and plan.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Montessori Implementation and Practice	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00