

St. Johns County School District

St. Augustine High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

St. Augustine High School

3205 VARELLA AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Travis	Principal	
Brown, Earl	Assistant Principal	Oversees the Deans and operations
Davis, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Oversees guidance and curriculum
Needham, Twila	Assistant Principal	LEA/ESE
Rust, Margo	Instructional Coach	ILC
Lakatos, Hannah	Instructional Coach	
Raimann, Robert	Other	CTE Admin

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We utilized input from faculty and student needs assessment surveys. We also reviewed data from previous years to identify our goals for the upcoming school year. The school leadership team collaborated to create goals in our identified areas of improvement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored using data from state assessments, summative assessments, and behavior data. It will be monitored in leadership team meetings, PLC team meetings, ILT meetings, and SAC meetings. If the data does not meet or exceeds identified benchmarks we will modify the plan.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	58	71	50	59	74	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				53			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			48		
Math Achievement*	36	61	38	48	50	38	53		
Math Learning Gains				52			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			41		
Science Achievement*	72	86	64	71	70	40	74		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	82	66	78	59	48	78		
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate	85	94	89	89	84	61	88		
College and Career Acceleration	68	64	65	63	86	67	61		
ELP Progress		51	45				73		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	85

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	89

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	2	
ELL	18	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	41			
HSP	61			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	58			36			72	76		85	68	
SWD	24			12			38	51		27	6	
ELL	18										1	
AMI												
ASN	74			60							2	
BLK	30			19			37	49		37	6	
HSP	59			33			69	64		59	6	
MUL	65			38			76	63		75	6	
PAC												
WHT	64			42			80	84		74	6	
FRL	44			25			55	64		56	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	53	44	48	52	36	71	78		89	63	
SWD	22	35	34	16	36	33	42	48		81	29	
ELL				30								
AMI												
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	
PAC												
WHT	66	57	46	56	57	34	78	82		88	68	
FRL	39	47	40	34	44	35	57	67		79	61	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	59	48	53	45	41	74	78		88	61	73
SWD	23	44	41	27	36	31	42	50		77	23	
ELL												73
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	69	64	60	60	49	46	77	84		86	69	
FRL	42	48	44	38	38	39	64	61		80	45	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	63%	73%	-10%	50%	13%
09	2023 - Spring	59%	70%	-11%	48%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	78%	-39%	50%	-11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	67%	-25%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	86%	-14%	63%	9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	82%	-5%	63%	14%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 math achievement and learning gains showed the lowest performance the previous school year. Math achievement has decreased each year since 2018. Factors that have contribute to this include teacher retention and a decrease in the achievement level of students enrolling at SAHS. The impact of Covid-19 coincided with the decrease in math achievement.

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

Math achievement and learning gains showed the greatest decline. Factors that have contribute to this include teacher retention and a decrease in the achievement level of students enrolling at SAHS. The impact of Covid-19 coincided with the decrease in math achievement.

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.

Math achievement and learning gains showed the greatest gap compared to the state average. Factors that have contribute to this include teacher retention and a decrease in the achievement level of students enrolling at SAHS. The impact of Covid-19 coincided with the decrease in math achievement.

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

ELA learning gains of the bottom 25 showed the greatest improvement. Our ILC and Assistant Principal identified students and trained teachers in high yield strategies to improve this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is our attendance. We had a high percentage of students absent more than 10%. Another area of concern is our percent of level 1 students.

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

1. Math Achievement and Instruction
2. ELA Achievement and Instruction
3. SWD Achievement and Instruction
4. School culture and student character development

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SAHS has had a decrease in student achievement in key areas dating back to 2019. We identified teacher retention and the level of student achievement from our incoming students as contributing factors. The development of Professional Learning Communities will fill these gaps by providing a support network for our teachers and will also lead to growth in instructional practice throughout our school. These combined efforts will increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Collaborative teams will meet regularly to share best practices for improving student achievement. They will use data derived from common assessments to drive their discussion and instruction. The measurable outcome is that all collaborative times will implement 10 common summative assessments during the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through our faculty One Note, admin observations, and class gradebooks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teacher Efficacy and Collaboration is one of the highest-yield interventions identified by Hattie's research.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PLC process is being implemented to promote teacher collaboration and greater use of high-yield strategies. Staff collaborating as a team will ensure all students receive the support necessary to reach their goals.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLC teams will meet regularly to focus on best practices and student data derived from common assessments. Teachers will focus on standards, common assessments, and using data to differentiate instruction.

Person Responsible: Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing goal with an identified end date of May 23rd.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SAHS has had significant teacher turnover over the past 4 years. This cycle of new teachers has impacted student achievement in all areas and contributed to a lack of continuity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SAHS hopes to retain 95% of its highly effective teachers year over year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using staffing data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will utilize teacher mentoring, the PLC process, faculty collaboration, and admin observations to accomplish our goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher retention will lead to continuity of the PLC process and will allow us to build on instructional initiatives year over year as opposed to having to retrain new faculty members each year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Recruit high quality teachers that fit our school culture
2. Develop a "New Jacket" mentoring program
3. Train and support implementation of the PLC process
4. Provide ongoing admin support to teachers and staff

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

By When: May 23rd, 2024

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our SWD subgroup was our lowest performing subgroup for the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in the SWD subgroup will increase their subgroup school grade by 12 points in both ELA and Math.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by PLC teams using their common assessment and FAST/EOC data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Twila Needham (twila.needham@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The PLC process, combined with high yield strategies and interventions will be utilized to improve this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Combined teacher efficacy with an increase in high-yield strategies and interventions will lead to higher student achievement for this subgroup.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Identify students in the SWD subgroup
2. Schedule students appropriately within the master schedule
3. Staff meets in collaborative teams to work on standards-based instruction and interventions.

Person Responsible: Twila Needham (twila.needham@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 23, 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student achievement for math was our lowest of any of the academic disciplines and has declined for the past 4 years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math student achievement at SAHS will rise 5% this school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor math student achievement through common assessments and state assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hannah Lakatos (hannah.lakatos@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will utilize teacher collaboration through the PLC process to monitor data and implement interventions and high yield instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher efficacy combined with targeted interventions will lead to increased student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Create PLC teams
2. Devise appropriate master schedule for the PLC process
3. PLC teams meet regularly to discuss data and interventions
4. ESE support facilitation appropriately utilized to support instruction

Person Responsible: Hannah Lakatos (hannah.lakatos@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 23, 2024

#5. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELL students at SAHS will make improvements in overall math achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELL students at SAHS will improve by 20% in math.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using common formative/summative assessments as well as state test data. Teachers in PLC teams will closely monitor the data and provide interventions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will utilize high-yield Kagan strategies for Tier 1 instruction. Additionally, we will utilize district resources for small-group teaching and interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Combined teacher efficacy with an increase in high-yield strategies and interventions will lead to higher student achievement for this subgroup.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Identify students in sub-group
2. Create common formative/summative assessments
3. Review data of formative/summative assessments
4. Plan and utilize time in the regular school day for small group interventions within the subgroup.

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

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

We utilize our SAC team to review all school improvement funding allocations. Additionally, our admin team reviews the school budget and allocates resources to fit areas of need.