

St. Johns County School District

# Patriot Oaks Academy



2020-21 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</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: 7/1/2016

<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>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	8%
<b>2019-20 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%)
<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, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

## 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	4%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

### 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
Zamparelli, Alexis	Assistant Principal	
Wimmer, Christopher	Other	testing coordinator

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Drew Chiodo

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

19

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

83

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 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>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	8%
<b>2019-20 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%)
<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> .	

## 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	127	135	150	154	134	167	157	178	194	0	0	0	0	1396
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	3	1	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	9	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	2	0	2	0	3	4	0	0	0	11

#### 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Tuesday 9/1/2020

#### 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	
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	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

**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	
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	0	4	3	7	6	0	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	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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.**

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%
	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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		

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
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
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
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%	0

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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

## 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?**

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:



**#1. Other specifically relating to ELA learning gains for lowest quartile**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	We have made great gains in ELA with our lowest quartile and need to keep that momentum going. We will continue that focus.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We want to see a 5 point increases in learning gains for our lowest quartile, 5 point gain in achievement in reading.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	i-Ready instruction for ELA offered in the computer lab in an after school tutoring program for all lowest quartile students based on latest FSA data, winter i-Ready 2019 and fall i-Ready 2020.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We used this differentiated program last year for tutoring but never got the chance to see the end of year data to determine the success of the program. We want to do it again as students enjoyed the experience and we saw growth on i-Ready.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Determine the target group, grades 4-8, based on the triad of data- by end of September 2020. Chris Wimmer
2. Purchase the i-Ready instructional- Allison Olson
3. Send invites to families- offer 4 days a week and require 3 days a week, 45 minutes each time; compile lists of students- Chris Wimmer
4. Hire teacher tutors to man the labs and assist students with learning gaps - Chris Wimmer
5. Do monthly checks on data with principal- Chris Wimmer
- 4.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Other specifically relating to Math learning gains for lowest quartile**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Lowest Quartile achievement and learning gains, Math
<b>Description and 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>Measurable Outcome:</b>	5 point increase in achievement and 5 point increase in learning gains for math
----------------------------	---

<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
---	---

<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	i-ready math instruction in an after school tutoring program i-Ready creates an individualized instructional path for students that can help to fill gaps and supplement the learning in the classroom.
---------------------------------	--

<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We used i-Ready in an afterschool lab this past year but were unable to complete the program and assess its success due to COVID19. We want to do it again to better track the data.
---	--

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Determine the list of students based on FSA data 2018, Winter i-Ready 2019, fall i-ready 2020. Chris Wimmer
2. Purchase i-Ready instruction for math- Allison Olson
3. Invite families
4. hire tutors/teachers for labs
5. Monitor growth monthly

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	---

### #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	As a continuation of our resource and elective project, building relationships will be our focus with our lowest quartile and students of color. We discuss each student, assign mentors and report back each WOW day (every 6 weeks). Teachers share the interactions they have had with their mentees and what they have learned about them. We feel that when students have significant adult relationships in school, they will improve academically.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</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.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify focus group.
2. Assign mentors.
3. Report back each WOW Wednesday (once per quarter)

**Person Responsible** Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Our areas of focus cover all the needs analysis mentioned in 2E.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We work hard to show value and appreciation to each of our stakeholders. Project Reach was developed this past year to showcase the diversity of our school with a survey and a large bulletin board with a map of the world showing where our families have come from. We were able to celebrate our diversity in that manner and plan to continue.

During the 4th quarter, when we went school-wide distance learning, we worked hard to maintain the family feel of our school and involve all of our staff and student body. We set up a daily message and shout out to our families through a private Patriot Oaks Academy YouTube channel. That was very well received and we continue it today for our distance learners. We also set up a support system for our families when we noticed that students were not logging in to on-line class or failing to hand in assignments. By involving many of our support staff, we called families, made home visits, delivered supplies and technology- all to support and show our community that they were important to us. As we being this year, we are already seeing a need to do this again with our distance learning population and have begun reaching out already. We always want our families to know we are here to support them.

Our SAC team is very active in our school and our needs assessment survey is positive. As we being our new year, we will discuss the results with them and address any concerns.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA learning gains for lowest quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Math learning gains for lowest quartile	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00