

St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2019-20 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%)
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 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.

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	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	33%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
Ranick, Richard	Dean	
Abbs, Trevor	Assistant Principal	
James, Corie	Dean	
Kizewski, Wayne	Other	Computer Technology
Yow, Jenna	Instructional Coach	
Bennet, Marjorie	School Counselor	
Teuscher, Jacob	Dean	
Hudson, Stephanie	Dean	
Barber, Cammy	School Counselor	
Woodall, Danielle	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Travis Brown

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.*

78

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

89

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	516	487	408	391	1802
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	85	86	99	354
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	72	29	34	230
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	85	77	50	301
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	86	78	50	303
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	54	41	40	244
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	127	96	88	77	388

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	34	22	20	20	96
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	7	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(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
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%
	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%
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

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
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
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%	0
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%	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	81
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	49
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	64
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	60
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	69
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	54
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.

The data component that performed the lowest was the English Language Arts lowest quartile. Within this category only 42% of students receive learning gains compared to the state average of 42%. This has been a low data component score for the last three years but has improved from 2018 with 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 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%, St. Augustine High School showed improvement. This indicates that St. Augustine High School should have improved in overall math achievement. One possible reason this area did not improve is the students entered at a lower level, they improved, but their improvement was 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.

St. Augustine High School was able to close the achievement gap in all of the categories compared to the state. St. Augustine High School was 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 could be due to an increased focus on the lowest 25% as well as the implementation of a remediation period to focus on areas where 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 category. The scores 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?

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

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

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

1. Math Learning Gains
2. English Language Arts Learning Gains
3. Positive Culture & Environment
4. Attendance
5. New Teacher Training
6. Schoolwide/Classroom Communication

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data, St. Augustine High School plans to focus on improving the math learning gains for the lowest 25% of students. The scores from the 2018-2019 school year and 2017-2018 school year were both below the district average. As a school, we would like to focus on ensuring the lowest 25% of students are proficient in math.
Measurable Outcome:	St. Augustine High School has set a goal of increasing the math learning gains of the lowest 25% from 48% in 2018-2019 to 60% during the current 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jenna Yow (jenna.yow@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We will utilize the Kagan Strategies and technological resources 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 collaborative PLC groups. While in these groups, teachers are developing common assessments 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 mastered.</p> <p>We are also continuing to have a 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 lowest quartile of students; thus increasing learning gains for those students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have seen success with these strategies in previous years. Through the PLC process we expect to see learning gains as we identify specific student needs. 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 standards. The strategies incorporate student's involvement and require students to work with the math, replacing the work on the math problem mentality and therefore increasing proficiency on the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Within the PLCs from each subject the team 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 Michelle Davis (michelle.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	St. Augustine High School will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in reading and writing. The data for the English Language Arts lowest 25% showed the minimal growth for students and the school score is below the district average. Reading and writing are pillars for all classes and improving these scores will aide students in other state tests, such as the Biology and United States History state assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	St. Augustine High School only had 42% of the lowest quartile of students achieve learning gains in English Language Arts. The goal is to increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile from 42% to 50% during the 2020-2021 school year. Additionally, St. Augustine High School has a goal to increase the learning gains for all students in the school from 58% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Woodall (danielle.woodall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC teams are formed to encourage teacher collaboration to ensure best practices in the classroom. The English and Reading teachers will focus on the key standards for each unit, develop common summative assessments, and compare data from the common summative tests to ensure that students are mastering the standards. The reading classes will use the computer program, Achieve3000, to provide explicit and targeted instruction for students in the lowest quartile. Additionally, the Literacy Leadership Team will have monthly meetings to discuss strategies for including reading and writing instruction in all content area classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC teams will be able to identify strategies that are most effective for each standard and analyze data collaboratively to best address the needs of their students. The teachers will use the data from the common assessments analyzed during PLC meetings to scaffold instruction and provide remediation through small group instruction. St. Augustine High School is following the Dufour model for the PLC process which has shown success in many of the schools that have implemented the PLC programs correctly.

Action Steps to Implement

Within the PLCs from each subject the team 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 Michelle Davis (michelle.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Graduation is one of the primary goals of the education system and improving the number of students that graduate on time is always a focus of 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. During the previous school year, 19.6% of the students at St. Augustine High School had attendance below 90%. Additionally, 12.7% of the students had one or more suspensions throughout the school year. Students missing school takes time away from their learning and can negatively impact their learning gains on the state assessments. Focusing on ensuring students are at school and remain in school can improve not only our attendance and discipline but student proficiency in reading and math.
Measurable Outcome:	St. Augustine High School is setting a goal to increase the graduation rate from 87% to 90% for students that graduate on time. This long-term goal is one that St. Augustine High School continues to work towards annually.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Lee (jill.lee@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing the graduation rate is linked to increasing the attendance at St. Augustine High School. In order to keep students on track for graduation St. Augustine High school has implemented two mentoring programs the Shine program and the LINK crew program. Within the LINK crew program, incoming freshman are assigned a student mentor to provide support and motivation throughout their freshman year. The program monitors the transition for students from middle to high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	St. Augustine High School has also implemented the Shine mentoring program. Through this program at-risk students, primarily seniors, are assigned a mentor through the leadership team. The mentor monitors the student's progress throughout the school year and provides motivation to meet the graduation requirements. Identification of students that are at risk is the first step in focusing targeted interventions to increase student success. Studies show that students who have a strong role model tend to find more academic success, increased attendance, and decreased behavior incidents. Our mentoring programs aim to support students in need of guidance as well as encourage positive behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that are at risk by analyzing school-wide reports.
2. The MTSS team meets weekly to discusses SIP goals, core instruction, resource allocation, teacher support systems, and small group needs. Students needing individual student-focused meetings are identified weekly and meetings are scheduled.
3. The Jacket Up Program is an incentive program that will highlight students that are doing well in school. Students will be rewarded and recognized for items such as: promptness, academic success, being positive, etc.
4. The goals of Jacket Swarm and the Link Crew are to encourage students to get involved in after school activities. Studies have shown that students who participate in extracurricular activities are more likely to be academically successful. The Link Crew provides student mentors to help make the transition into high school for ninth graders as smooth and positive as possible.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Attendance: St. Augustine High School's leadership team has several plans in place to increase the attendance of students during our current pandemic. Teachers are being asked to teach both brick and mortar as well as simultaneously to any distance learner students. This model allows for any students that may have been absent from school in the past to still be present for the lesson and increase overall learning as compared to being absent in previous school years. The school counselors have worked with families to ensure that our students have the technology necessary to complete school remotely or on campus.

2. New teacher training: Our new teachers have all been paired with mentors throughout the school to assist them during their first year of teaching. St. Augustine High School has also given new teachers several instructional training to help ensure best practices are being utilized within the classroom. New teachers work with their PLC team to develop lesson plans and analyze common summative and formative assessments. The inclusion of the PLC process allows new teachers to feel supported through the team and ensure they have support.

3. School-Wide and Classroom Communication: Schoology is being utilized by our teachers and administration to communicate with students, staff, and each other. Teachers were given a training on how to utilize Schoology to communicate with students, perform synchronization with online instruction as well as share resources within their departments.

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.

Counseling support is provided when an individual student is in need. Some students are provided a GO pass to aide in day-to-day positive behavior.

All incoming 9th grade students will be enrolled in the Jacket 101 course which focuses on supporting students as they adjust from middle school to high school.

St. Augustine High School is also using the Jacket-Up incentive program as an established way for teachers to highlight students who have demonstrated improvement in any area. The Jacket Up program provides monthly and quarterly awards that focus on creating a positive culture and learning environment. Community partners such as Zaxby's, Mellow Mushroom, and our PTO provide support through incentives

and financial support for the program.

The Jacket-Up incentive program also includes a team of students called the Jacket-Up SWARM who help plan events throughout the school year. These events focus on celebrating their peers as well as increasing school morale and encouraging all students to be involved. The students in Jacket-Up SWARM strive to make a positive influence on their school and peers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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