

St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
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: 7/18/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	31%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	B	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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.

Teachers, students, and stakeholders collaborate to build a strong school community through teambuilding, literacy instruction, and learning for college and career readiness for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Augustine High School is a school of positive and passionate culture builders who develop trust and respect while building a community that values all students. Teachers work with students to grow readers and leaders in all subject areas.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Graham, DeArmas	Principal	
Abbs, Trevor	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Needham, Twila	Assistant Principal	
Raimann, Robert	Other	
Rust, Margo	Instructional Coach	* Support all teachers with a focus on the Reading, English, and Social Studies departments * Assist with the implementation of professional development as well as supporting all goals of the school
Willis, Tina	Instructional Coach	* Support all teachers with a focus on Math and Science departments * Assist with the implementation of professional development as well as supporting all goals of the school

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/18/2022, Travis Brown

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

84

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,781

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

28

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

28

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	0

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/18/2022

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	471	464	443	415	1793
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	137	143	132	554
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	55	35	20	186
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	160	132	89	527
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	81	48	34	271
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	143	138	118	93	492

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	89	90	60	37	276
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	471	464	443	415	1793
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	137	143	132	554
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	55	35	20	186
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	160	132	89	527
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	81	48	34	271
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	0	143	138	118	93	492

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	0	89	90	60	37	276
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	74%	51%				65%	74%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						58%	60%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						42%	50%	42%
Math Achievement	48%	50%	38%				58%	73%	51%
Math Learning Gains	52%						56%	58%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						48%	55%	45%
Science Achievement	71%	70%	40%				88%	86%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	59%	48%				83%	88%	73%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

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
2022					
2019	90%	87%	3%	67%	23%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	86%	88%	-2%	70%	16%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	79%	-40%	61%	-22%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	81%	-6%	57%	18%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	35	34	16	36	33	42	48		81	29
ELL				30							
ASN	64	70									
BLK	26	41	41	24	43	42	35	48		92	35
HSP	50	46	40	35	36	28	65	90		87	50
MUL	66	52		57	56		69	83		94	63
WHT	66	57	46	56	57	34	78	82		88	68
FRL	39	47	40	34	44	35	57	67		79	61
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	44	41	27	36	31	42	50		77	23
ELL											
ASN	63	60									
BLK	20	35	31	18	28	29	42	48		91	39
HSP	57	60	47	55	45	46	100	89		92	39
MUL	69	58		65	53		85				
WHT	69	64	60	60	49	46	77	84		86	69
FRL	42	48	44	38	38	39	64	61		80	45
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	67
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	43
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	53
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	68

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends that emerge across grade levels include math data with a decrease in achievement since 2019. The overall math score for 2021 was at a 48%. Ours students demonstrated EOC of 48% proficiency. We will work to increase this percentage to 45%. Our student failure and suspensions are higher in 9th grade and begin to decline as students reach 12th grade. Trends that emerge are our subgroups continue to make improvements especially as the subgroups move to junior and senior year. Students in 9th and 10th grade could use coaching on the importance of all courses and grades and behavior choices.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

82.6 percent students scored a level 1 or 2 on the 21-22 English Language Arts Assessments. 51.9 percent of SAHS students performed at level 1 or 2 on the 21-22 Mathematics Assessments. 28.9 students performed level 1 or 2 on Science Assessment, and 22.3 percent scored a level 1 or 2 on the Social Studies Assessment.

Students with socio economic disadvantage have a larger learning gap than their subgroup in most content areas. The lowest 25% of Hispanic students no in lowest quartile score among the highest in the school across math and English/language arts.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The need for improvement could be in indicator of allocating resources and energy toward the lowest 25% to get those student to perform better. We would need to include programs that can focus on all students as well as the lowest quartile to help ensure a more even distribution of improvement.

Focusing on literacy strategies across the curriculum for all topics is a strategy employed at SAHS. Within this subgroup building knowledge and vocabulary could be very useful. Relevant background knowledge and vocabulary largely determine how well students understand what they read. We can bolster students' comprehension of grade-level text by building knowledge and vocabulary in a variety of ways.

Other areas that would need to be addressed is keeping the minority group in school and engaged in school. A strategy here would be to mentor and make efforts to show the importance of school as well as make efforts in making sure that there is an extracurricular activity that could get them involved.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The math data showed a decrease in achievement since 2019 but a growth of 7%! This is exciting, The overall math score for 2021 was at a 48%. When measured by the EOC, 48% of St. Augustine High School students demonstrated proficiency. We will work to increase this percentage to 60% proficient. When measured by the EOC, 36% of students scoring in lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains. We will work to increase this percentage to 45%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors are teachers working collaboratively in PLC's using standards based instruction as well as classroom formative and summative assessments to help guide reteaching of missed standards and gaps in learning.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Standards Based Teaching and Learning is the Priority, What do students Know, What do they need to know, building lessons on standards and what students need to know with rubrics aligned to the standards help students keep track of where they are in their own learning path.

Evaluate standards and importance and time needed to teach each standards, teachers will make best choices in conference with PLC to determine most important standards for the course.

Identifying what students do not know and focusing on filling those gaps early is imperative to standards based teaching.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

PLC teams are formed to encourage teacher collaboration to ensure best practices in the classroom. The math teachers will focus on the key standards for each unit, develop common assessments, and compare data to ensure that students are mastering the standards. . Additionally, the Literacy Leadership Team will have monthly meetings to discuss strategies math instruction in all content area classrooms. We will continue to have deliberately placed support teachers in core math classes 4 days a week to provide differentiated instruction for our lowest quartile students. Professional development opportunities are implemented monthly. These sessions are led by administration for all faculty members. Teachers are encouraged to attend district PD offerings as well as AP and AICE PD offerings

off campus and or virtually. A new teachers cadre is in action at SAHS meeting monthly with all teachers new to SAHS, this offers extra support across all areas at SAHS.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Emphasis on PLC strategies across all subject areas. Cultivating collaboration and shared responsibility amongst the staff will allow for meaningful collaboration to foster building teacher leadership in PLC process. Increasing staff retention, in order to maintain consistency with development we need to do encourage our teachers to return from year to year. Consistent communication with teachers and valuing their feedback, meeting their needs to encourage staff retention will help ensure sustainability into the future.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

St. Augustine High School will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in the areas of reading and writing. The English Language Arts data showed a slight decrease in achievement. Reading and writing are foundational in all subject areas. Increasing student learning gains will have a positive affect on learning across curricularly.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

When measured by the FSA, 59% of St. Augustine High School students demonstrated proficiency. We will work to increase this percentage to 65% proficient. When measured by the FSA, 44% of students scoring in lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains. We will work to increase this percentage to 50.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

St. Augustine High School teachers will work within their PLC teams to plan for the implementation of literacy strategies within the classroom. Teacher progress will be monitored through regular classroom observations, as well as documentation within PLC groups.

Students growth will be monitored throughout the year and by our Instructional Literacy Coach, Margo Rust.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margo Rust (margo.rust@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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 assessments, and compare data 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.

We will utilize two reading tutors to assist teachers with small group instruction to target gaps in instruction. Additionally, tutors groups will be determined by common assessment data, and will be fluctuating depending on student need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the

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. Teachers will analyze data from common assessments during PLC meetings to scaffold instruction and provide remediation through small group instruction. The

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

reading tutors' work will be data driven and targeted specifically to student need. 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 process correctly.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Within the PLCs from each subject the team will:

1. Analyze data from district and state assessments.
2. Develop a Smart Goal, focusing on key standards for each course.
3. Establish best practices and methods of instruction
4. Develop common assessments.
4. Share common assessment data to identify student need and instructional next steps
5. Develop a plan for classroom and tutorial sessions for student remediation

Person Responsible

Michelle Davis (michelle.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

St. Augustine High School will increase the percentage of students who are proficient in the areas of math. The math data showed a decrease in achievement since 2019. The overall math score for 2021 was at a 48%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

When measured by the EOC, 48% of St. Augustine High School students demonstrated proficiency. We will work to increase this percentage to 60% proficient. When measured by the EOC, 36% of students scoring in lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains. We will work to increase this percentage to 45%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

St. Augustine High School teachers will work within their PLC teams to plan for the implementation of researched based strategies within the classroom. Teacher progress will be monitored through regular classroom observations, as well as documentation within PLC groups. Students growth will be monitored throughout the year and by our Instructional Coach, Tina Willis and Assistant Principal, Trevor Abbs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trevor Abbs (trevor.abbs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

PLC teams are formed to encourage teacher collaboration to ensure best practices in the classroom. The math teachers will focus on the key standards for each unit, develop common assessments, and compare data to ensure that students are mastering the standards. . Additionally, the Literacy Leadership Team will have monthly meetings to discuss strategies math instruction in all content area classrooms. We will continue to have deliberately placed support teachers in core math classes 4 days a week to provide differentiated instruction for our lowest quartile students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the

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. Teachers will analyze data from common assessments during PLC meetings to scaffold instruction and provide remediation through small group instruction. Math teacher planning will be data driven and targeted specifically to student need. 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 process correctly.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Hired Instructional Coach to support math teachers and help with lesson designing. Model effective instructional strategies for teachers in the math department. Attend PLC meetings to discuss the four DeFour questions.

Person Responsible Trevor Abbs (trevor.abbs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

St. Augustine High School received data from the Florida Department of Education concerning the ESSA subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

SAHS will improve the SWD and ELL subgroups by 5% for the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Area of Focus will be monitored by school counselors, teachers, and administrators. School counselors & teachers met with all SWD students at the beginning of the school year to build positive relationships. Each student receive a device to support them in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Davis (michelle.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Formative checks and EOC/FSA data will be the plan for checking student growth. RTI/MTSS process to monitor the effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Formative checks and EOC/FSA data will be the plan for checking student growth. RTI/MTSS process to monitor the effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Building positive relationships
2. Monitor student progress
3. Reflect and share student data
4. Include all stakeholders, school counselors, parent, teacher, administration and student when making decisions.

Person Responsible

DeArmas Graham (dearmas.graham@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. St. Augustine High School received data from the Florida Department of Education concerning the ESSA subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. SAHS will improve the SWD and ELL subgroups by 5% for the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. The Area of Focus will be monitored by school counselors, teachers, and administrators. School counselors & teachers met with all SWD students at the beginning of the school year to build positive relationships. Each student receive a device to support them in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Formative checks and EOC/FSA data will be the plan for checking student growth. RTI/MTSS process to monitor the effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Formative checks and EOC/FSA data will be the plan for checking student growth. RTI/MTSS process to monitor the effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

St. Augustine High School is continuing to implement 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.

SAHS Link Crew continues to assist students as they transition to high school. These students are ambassadors who work throughout the school year to create positive relationships with all students.

Students at St. Augustine High School are encouraged to enroll in Career Academies or Programs of Choice. St. Augustine High School offers The Aviation and Aerospace Academy, The Academy of Future Teachers, The Academy of Law and Homeland Security, Army Junior ROTC, and the St. Johns County Center for the Arts. These programs prepare students for post-secondary education or the workforce, as well as provide them a strong sense of community during high school. These students proudly participate in extracurricular clubs or student organizations related to their program, and learn through real-world projects and experiences.

St. Augustine High School will implement a new student recognition program this school year. Teachers will provide student nominations for "Buzz Behaviors." Students who consistently demonstrate desired behaviors will be recognized. One student from each grade level will be recognized on the morning announcements each Friday. They will be given a Yellow Jacket Lanyard Pin.

The student services department will continue to utilize Restorative Practices with individual and groups of students to build a sense of responsible school community participation.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Bobby Esguerra, Jennifer Bowmaster, and Amy Huber are the Link Crew sponsors. They work with eleventh and twelfth grade students to build a strong student ambassador program at SAHS.

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.

Robert Raimann is the Career and Program Specialist at St. Augustine High School. He showcases our academies at recruitment events for middle and high school students. He encourages students to take part in our offered programs by visiting classrooms and building positive relationships. He also consistently monitors academic performance, behavior, and attendance of all academy students. Providing these students with support and giving them meaningful feedback helps to increase program completion rates. Mr. Raimann works to increase the number of industry certification opportunities offered at St. Augustine High School, helping our graduates to become strong candidates for future employers.

Michelle Davis will spearhead the new weekly student recognitions.

Trevor Abbs is the leader of the deans for our restorative practices at St. Augustine High School. He monitors at risk students, guides them to the correct behaviors, and has positive reinforcements procedures that aim to redirect student behavior.