

St. Johns County School District

St. Johns Technical High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

St. Johns Technical High School

2970 COLLINS AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

www-sjths.stjohns.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Nigel Pillay

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/15/2020.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of St. Johns Technical High School is to customize and deliver an appropriate learning path for each student in a supportive and responsive environment where students who might not otherwise experience success are encouraged to develop a strong work ethic while exploring vocational opportunities and achieving high standards in character and academics.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of St. Johns Technical High School is to cultivate self-reliant, productive citizens with aspirations for lifelong success in a diverse, changing, and complex society.

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
Pillay, Nigel	Principal	The Principal is responsible for the recruitment, training and retention of highly qualified teachers. As the instructional leader, it is paramount to provide teachers with modeling of effective high-yield strategies, resources and training opportunities to yield academic improvement for students.
Davis, Paula	Instructional Coach	Provides coaching and support, especially in the area of Reading, to all teachers and students. Facilitates collaboration with outside volunteers, teachers and Professional Learning Communities to promote reading and help all students become successful, confident readers.
Winter, Holli	Assistant Principal	Facilitates learning opportunities for staff development and aides teachers by being an instructional leader and support personnel. Ensures compliance with all safety and operational mandates.
Church, Richard	Administrative Support	The APEX (Drop Out Prevention Specialist) operates the APEX program at SJTHS, for over age and under grade students. The APEX Coordinator monitors and intervenes with regards to student academic progress, attendance and conduct with the goal of improving reading and math proficiency for 6th -8th grade APEX Program student population targeted at-risk for not graduating with their kindergarten cohort.
Esguerra, Sarah	Guidance Counselor	Ensures the needs of all students are met with regard to mental health, graduation requirements, and career goals. Assists with and facilitates the testing schedule, training of staff members and counsels with students on scores and goals needed to ensure graduation.
Johnson-Cassella, Helen	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/27/2020, Nigel Pillay

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.*

2

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

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	34	32	50	55	46	51	41	309
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	7	9	12	4	8	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	9	8	14	3	5	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4	1	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	2	2	3	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
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	1	3	6	3	3	8	4	28

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	18	16	23	23	25	18	17	140
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3	4	4	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

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	43	33	42	47	43	23	55	286
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	16	12	15	7	28	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	19	9	8	5	13	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	5	4	2	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	23	30	24	24	13	28	176

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	18	13	24	13	13	6	20	107

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	1	2	3	2	1	1	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	5	5	2	19

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	43	33	42	47	43	23	55	286
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	16	12	15	7	28	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	19	9	8	5	13	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	5	4	2	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	23	30	24	24	13	28	176

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	18	13	24	13	13	6	20	107

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	1	2	3	2	1	1	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	5	5	2	19

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	0%	74%	56%	20%	67%	56%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	51%	41%	59%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	50%	42%	56%	52%	44%
Math Achievement	0%	73%	51%	28%	66%	51%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	48%	46%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	45%	55%	52%	45%
Science Achievement	0%	86%	68%	36%	78%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	88%	73%	44%	81%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	14%	74%	-60%	54%	-40%
	2018	16%	71%	-55%	52%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	7%	72%	-65%	52%	-45%
	2018	15%	70%	-55%	51%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	7%	71%	-64%	56%	-49%
	2018	12%	76%	-64%	58%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
09	2019	2%	75%	-73%	55%	-53%
	2018	16%	74%	-58%	53%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
10	2019	10%	74%	-64%	53%	-43%
	2018	22%	76%	-54%	53%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	18%	74%	-56%	55%	-37%
	2018	16%	73%	-57%	52%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	30%	80%	-50%	54%	-24%
	2018	13%	80%	-67%	54%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	38%	78%	-40%	46%	-8%
	2018	37%	73%	-36%	45%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	18%	72%	-54%	48%	-30%
	2018	28%	75%	-47%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	87%	-34%	67%	-14%
2018	32%	84%	-52%	65%	-33%
Compare		21%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	90%	-50%	71%	-31%
2018	40%	89%	-49%	71%	-31%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	88%	-44%	70%	-26%
2018	41%	87%	-46%	68%	-27%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	79%	-52%	61%	-34%
2018	18%	79%	-61%	62%	-44%
Compare		9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	81%	-60%	57%	-36%
2018	24%	77%	-53%	56%	-32%
Compare		-3%			

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	38	59	22	42	54	32	36		83	20
BLK	14	41	52	19	33	38	17	29			
WHT	23	41	65	34	53	69	48	52		86	16
FRL	18	42	60	22	44	54	35	40		86	28

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	43
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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
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	46
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

2% of 9th grade ELA students were able to demonstrate proficiency. As the expectations increase from middle to high school, our struggling readers continue to lack the ability to decode while the Lexile level continues to increase. After testing students using Fox in a Box, a phonemic awareness assessment, it was found that 24 of our 32 (75%) students could not demonstrate the decoding skills that should be mastered by the 3rd grade. When looking at ESSA subgroup data, Black students performed at 36% while all students were at 43% proficiency. Similarly, economically disadvantaged students performed at 40% while all students were at 43% proficiency.

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

The 9th grade ELA cohort showed the greatest decline, with 14%. As SJTHS is a school of choice, we are continually accepting new students throughout the year and have a transient population, which does not support consistency with programs being used and tracking student progress and growth. After testing students using Fox in a Box, a phonemic awareness assessment, it was found that 75% of 9th grade students could not demonstrate the decoding skills that should be mastered by the 3rd grade.

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

The greatest gap is in the 9th grade ELA, at -53% when compared to the state average. As a school that has 90% of the population with an IEP, almost all that specifically address reading deficiencies, and actively recruits the lowest level students from the District, we are aware that the area of Reading is our greatest challenge. Around 60% of the student population of SJTHS could not demonstrate the decoding skills that should be mastered by the 3rd grade.

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

Our 7th grade Math cohort improved the most, by 17%. Students benefited from having Math and Intensive Math daily. The Intensive Math period gave the students a dedicated time to practice the skills that were taught earlier in the day. Students were also actively using technology each day with activity centers, which included IXL, Khan Academy and iReady.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

As we prepare our students to be successful, post high school, an area of concern can be noted with our senior class. The two areas of concern are the attendance rate and scoring Level 1 on the FSA. 28 out of 55 seniors, or 51%, have an attendance rate below 90% and have scored a Level 1.

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

1. Subgroup Data: Black
2. Subgroup Data: Economically Disadvantaged
3. Reading
4. Math
5. Social/Emotional Learning/School Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data shows that Black students perform at 36% proficiency. According to the ESSA requirements, any subgroup performing below 41% is identified as an area of focus that needs improvement.

Measureable Outcome: We must increase this category by 5% to meet ESSA requirements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: In Reading, research based and district approved programs will be used in order to support students based on their specific needs and data. Wilson Reading Systems and REWARDS will be the programs utilized and students will be specifically scheduled in to the class that is needed. Newly created position of Reading Interventionist will also be able to deliver and help with targeted intervention. In Math, Intensive Math has been added back to the schedule to deliver necessary instruction and remediation. Programs such as IXL and iReady will be utilized by the teachers to improve math skills and track student progress. At SJTHS, a School Counselor and an on site Mental Health counselor will work to support these students to meet their social-emotional, academic and college/career goals and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Wilson Reading Systems (WRS) is used to structured literacy program based on phonological-coding research and Orton-Gillingham principles, WRS directly and systematically teaches the structure of the English language. REWARDS is a powerful research-based, short-term, and specialized program for adolescent students in grades 4-12 who struggle reading long, multi-syllabic words and comprehending content-area text. With explicit, systemic, teacher-led instruction, this intervention gives students new skills to unlock grade-level content-area text. Both programs are district approved and have also provided training and resource kits for our teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Appropriately schedule students in reading classes (Paula Davis)
2. Train and support Reading and Math teachers (Paula Davis)
3. Use additional funds to hire Reading Interventionist (Nigel Pillay)
4. Collect, analyze and review data on student progress in order to make instructional decisions (ILC and Administration)
5. Targeted social/emotional support from School and Mental Health Counselor (School Counselor and Mental Health Counselor)

Person Responsible Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data shows that Economically Disadvantaged students perform at 40% proficiency. According to the ESSA requirements, any subgroup performing below 41% is identified as an area of focus that needs improvement.

Measureable Outcome: We must increase this category by 1% to meet ESSA requirements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: In Reading, research based and district approved programs will be used in order to support students based on their specific needs and data. Wilson Reading Systems and REWARDS will be the programs utilized and students will be specifically scheduled in to the class that is needed. Newly created position of Reading Interventionist will also be able to deliver and help with targeted intervention. In Math, Intensive Math has been added back to the schedule to deliver necessary instruction and remediation. Programs such as IXL and iReady will be utilized by the teachers to improve math skills and track student progress. At SJTHS, a School Counselor and an on site Mental Health counselor will work to support these students to meet their social-emotional, academic and college/career goals and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Wilson Reading Systems (WRS) is used to structured literacy program based on phonological-coding research and Orton-Gillingham principles, WRS directly and systematically teaches the structure of the English language. REWARDS is a powerful research-based, short-term, and specialized program for adolescent students in grades 4-12 who struggle reading long, multi-syllabic words and comprehending content-area text. With explicit, systemic, teacher-led instruction, this intervention gives students new skills to unlock grade-level content-area text. Both programs are district approved and have also provided training and resource kits for our teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Appropriately schedule students in reading classes (Paula Davis)
2. Train and support Reading and Math teachers (Paula Davis)
3. Use additional funds to hire Reading Interventionist (Nigel Pillay)
4. Collect, analyze and review data on student progress in order to make instructional decisions (ILC and Administration)
5. Targeted social/emotional support from School and Mental Health Counselor (School Counselor and Mental Health Counselor)

Person Responsible Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reading is a top area of focus as only 8% of students showed proficiency on the ELA FSA. School data also shows that 60% of all students are have not learned the decoding skills that should have been mastered by the 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome: The school goal is to increase the ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 50 to 52%. The Instructional Literacy Coach, the Reading Collaborative team and Reading Interventionist, will be responsible for continually monitoring the lowest quartile throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paula Davis (paula.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: In Reading, research based and district approved programs will be used in order to support students based on their specific needs and data. Wilson Reading Systems and REWARDS will be the programs utilized and students will be specifically scheduled in to the class that is needed. Newly created position of Reading Interventionist will also be able to deliver and help with targeted intervention, along with the Instructional Literacy Coach. Achieve 3000 will also be utilized in 9-12 grade ELA classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Wilson Reading Systems (WRS) is used to structured literacy program based on phonological-coding research and Orton-Gillingham principles, WRS directly and systematically teaches the structure of the English language. REWARDS is a powerful research-based, short-term, and specialized program for adolescent students in grades 4-12 who struggle reading long, multi-syllabic words and comprehending content-area text. With explicit, systemic, teacher-led instruction, this intervention gives students new skills to unlock grade-level content-area text. Achieve 3000 ensure all students in grades 9-12, especially the most vulnerable, continue to accelerate learning in literacy to close the gap and stay on-track. Both programs are district approved and have also provided training and resource kits for our teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students for specific programs
2. Schedule students for appropriate classes
3. Purchase and train teachers in programs
4. Utilize Reading Interventionist to aid Instructional Literacy Coach in collecting, reviewing, and analyzing data

Person Responsible Paula Davis (paula.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Algebra End Of Course (EOC) learning gains dropped 8% from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year. As the EOC is a graduation requirement, SJTHS will be committed to tracking and monitoring these students.
Measureable Outcome:	SJTHS will work on improving Lowest Quartile Learning Gains to 60% to meet the district goal. The Math collaborative team will be responsible for monitoring this goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SJTHS will continue to use iReady for Middle School students and IXL for middle and high school data collection and progress monitoring. iReady is a district supported program to use for Math. The school will schedule Middle School students in Intensive Math as needed based on prior data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reports that help you focus instruction for students, small groups, and the whole class. i-Ready's detailed student portraits help teachers plan next steps for instruction. iReady is a district supported program to use for Middle School Math students and training is also provided through purchase of the program and toolbox. IXL helps students gain fluency and confidence in math. IXL helps students master essential skills at their own pace through fun and interactive questions, built in support, and motivating awards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify and schedule students for Intensive Math classes (Math PLC and Registrar)
2. Purchase and train teachers for use of programs (Nigel Pillay and ILC)
3. Assess students with diagnostics (Math PLC)
4. Utilize Math PLC in collecting, reviewing, and analyzing data

Person Responsible Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

As many of our students have faced numerous hardships, setbacks and adverse situations, we at SJTHS make it a priority to focus on social and emotional well being of every student. ESSA data shows that Economically Disadvantaged students perform at 40% proficiency. According to the ESSA requirements, any subgroup performing below 41% is identified as an area of focus that needs improvement. As a Title I school, we know there is a direct correlation to this identified population and a student's social emotional well-being. As a result, it is our mission to ensure we focus on the whole child and work to meet not only their educational and academic needs, but also cater to social/emotional needs, career and college preparedness, and character development.

Measureable Outcome:

According to EWS data, 17% of students have received out of school or in school suspension. Through a focused school wide positive behavior approach, our goal would be to reduce that number by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Each month, we focus on a character pillar and have a Staff and Student of the Month award. Teachers are able to nominate students and all nominees area awarded and recognized. One main winner is selected to receive a gift card (donated by sponsors), and t-shirt (donated by business partner) and have their picture displayed for the month. Ms. Kelly Thigpen, Character Education Coordinator, also comes to SJTHS to model character lessons and activities within the classroom.

Evidence-based Strategy:

We also will implement a Mentorship program for students who are struggling with behavior. These students are individually tracked, worked with to set goals, and are rewarded at the end of each week for making their goals. Students who do not make their goals spend time with the Guidance Counselor to work on strategies that would help when they are feeling overwhelmed or frustrated.

Finally, we proudly celebrate students quarterly by hosting Honor Roll and Character Counts! celebrations. Students are given the royal treatment with music, decorations, family and friends to celebrate their academic and character achievements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Focusing on school culture and implementing positive behavior rewards systems through our Success Coach will help reduce overall behavior incidents. The Success Coach will be able to pull available resources from the community, apply for grants and seek business partnerships to purchase resources for the programs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Targeting and assigning students to Mentorship program (Success Coach and MTSS team)
2. Collecting funds and resources to supplement programs and initiatives (Success Coach)
3. Training students and staff on Character Counts! initiatives (Success Coach and Holli Winter)
4. Success Coach will collect, review and analyze data

Person Responsible Nigel Pillay (nigel.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An area of concern can be noted with our senior class that has not yet been addressed in our areas of focus.

The School Counselor will lead the Graduation Success PLC team. The team will meet bi-weekly to discuss academic progress, attendance and progress towards graduation. The team consists of School Counselor, lab teachers, Success Coach, Learning Strategies teacher and APEX Coordinator.

The School Counselor will also meet with Seniors, at least monthly on an individual basis, to discuss graduation requirements, grades, post-graduation plans and attendance. Open lines of communication between School Counselor and parents or guardians of Seniors is a priority.

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.

As many of our students have faced numerous hardships, setbacks and adverse situations, we at SJTHS make it a priority to focus on success and kindness. Our theme this year is 20/20 Vision, and each department has worked to develop positive displays and messages throughout the school to promote the theme.

Each month, we focus on a character pillar and have a Staff and Student of the Month award. Teachers are able to nominate students and fellow staff members and all nominees are awarded and recognized. One main winner is selected to receive a gift card (donated by sponsors), and t-shirt (donated by business partner) and have their picture displayed for the month. Ms. Kelly Thigpen, Character Education Coordinator, also comes to SJTHS to model character lessons and activities within the classroom.

At monthly faculty trainings, we spend the first ten to fifteen minutes of the meeting opening with celebrations and staff shout outs. Staff members are able to support or brag on other co-workers who have amazing things going on in their classrooms or pitched in to support an event.

Throughout the school year, Administration takes the time to celebrate staff during holidays and Teacher Appreciation Week. Fun games, treats and meals are provided to cultivate a feeling of appreciation and family atmosphere.

We also implement a Mentorship program for students who are struggling with behavior. These students are individually tracked, worked with to set goals, and are rewarded at the end of each week for making their goals. Students who do not make their goals spend time with the School Counselor to work on strategies that would help when they are feeling overwhelmed or frustrated.

Finally, we proudly celebrate students quarterly by hosting Honor Roll and Character Counts! celebrations. Students are given the royal treatment with music, decorations, family and friends to celebrate their academic and character achievements. The celebration continues with a meal and cake, served by our Culinary Academy students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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