# Gulf Middle School



# 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Gulf Middle School

## 6419 LOUISIANA AVE, New Port Richey, FL 34653

## https://gms.pasco.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

### Principal: Amy Riddle

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 85% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (46%)<br><br>2017-18: C (48%)<br><br>2016-17: C (47%)<br><br>2015-16: D (36%)<br><br>2014-15: C (42%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |

| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
|---|---|

\* 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 Pasco 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

# Gulf Middle School

6419 LOUISIANA AVE, New Port Richey, FL 34653

https://gms.pasco.k12.fl.us

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2018-19 Title I School** | **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 85% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 42% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | C | C | D |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.**

"Dream it, Own it, Live it"

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

All GMS students will be life, career and college ready.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Riddle, Amy | Principal | |
| Kledzik, Karen | Assistant Principal | |
| Mobley, Lori | Assistant Principal | |

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 344 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1056 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 69 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 40 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 29 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 102 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 371 |
| | 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 64 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 | |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

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

Thursday 8/22/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

### Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attendance below 90 percent | 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 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## 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 | 41% | 52% | 54% | 34% | 50% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | 55% | 54% | 45% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 47% | 47% | 41% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 60% | 58% | 43% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 57% | 61% | 57% | 53% | 58% | 57% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 52% | 51% | 46% | 48% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 44% | 52% | 51% | 38% | 45% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 51% | 68% | 72% | 59% | 70% | 70% |

## EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 369 (0) | 344 (0) | 343 (0) | 1056 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 75 () | 69 () | 90 () | 234 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 39 () | 40 () | 56 () | 135 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 46 () | 29 () | 95 () | 170 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 125 () | 102 () | 144 () | 371 (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.

NOTE: 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 |
| 06 | 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 54% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 51% | -14% | 52% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 32% | 51% | -19% | 52% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 51% | -18% | 51% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 42% | 58% | -16% | 56% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 58% | -18% | 58% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 48% | 59% | -11% | 55% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 53% | -10% | 52% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 26% | 42% | -16% | 54% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 44% | -6% | 54% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 61% | 68% | -7% | 46% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 63% | -13% | 45% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 23% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 48% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 53% | -15% | 50% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 49% | 70% | -21% | 71% | -22% |
| 2018 | 53% | 71% | -18% | 71% | -18% |
| Compare | | -4% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 60% | 40% | 61% | 39% |
| 2018 | 92% | 63% | 29% | 62% | 30% |
| Compare | | 8% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 56% | -56% |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 28 | 40 | 40 | 37 | 52 | 42 | 37 | 35 | | | |
| ELL | 16 | 42 | 41 | 35 | 56 | 50 | 7 | 27 | | | |
| ASN | 43 | 29 | | 57 | 69 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 44 | 40 | 28 | 44 | 31 | 29 | 22 | | | |
| HSP | 31 | 48 | 47 | 49 | 57 | 48 | 30 | 43 | 35 | | |
| MUL | 40 | 37 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 30 | 53 | 58 | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 49 | 42 | 57 | 58 | 49 | 50 | 58 | 32 | | |
| FRL | 39 | 47 | 45 | 49 | 55 | 46 | 41 | 51 | 29 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 8 | 31 | 34 | 19 | 46 | 49 | 17 | 28 | | | |
| ELL | 8 | 39 | 54 | 21 | 43 | 36 | 31 | 20 | | | |
| ASN | 41 | 53 | | 56 | 63 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 45 | 45 | 27 | 56 | 71 | | 40 | | | |
| HSP | 30 | 42 | 48 | 45 | 54 | 46 | 42 | 39 | 54 | | |
| MUL | 37 | 46 | 58 | 60 | 68 | 50 | 47 | 67 | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 46 | 36 | 53 | 59 | 52 | 40 | 61 | 55 | | |
| FRL | 33 | 42 | 42 | 46 | 57 | 51 | 37 | 50 | 48 | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 8 | 41 | 44 | 18 | 42 | 44 | 18 | 24 | | | |
| ELL | 12 | 49 | 40 | 9 | 32 | 39 | | 53 | | | |
| ASN | 56 | 59 | | 50 | 44 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 48 | 50 | 37 | 45 | 26 | 32 | 57 | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 46 | 40 | 33 | 49 | 51 | 29 | 51 | 57 | | |
| MUL | 35 | 38 | | 48 | 53 | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| WHT | 37 | 45 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 47 | 38 | 64 | 58 | | |
| FRL | 31 | 43 | 40 | 39 | 52 | 48 | 34 | 55 | 64 | | |

## 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 | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 28 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 445 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 34 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **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% | |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 50 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 33 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 42 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 47 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **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% | |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 49 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 43 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Our two biggest areas of concern were lowest 25% in math and social studies achievement. Last year our 7th grade cohort struggled because of a lack of certified teachers in the area of math and social studies. The entire civics team was new to the curriculum. 7th grade math had substitutes and not qualified teachers.

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

The greatest decline was in the area of lowest 25% in math. The lack of qualified teachers in math was a contributing factor to this decline.

**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 was in the area of social studies achievement. In 7th grade civics one entire class had a long term sub for the majority of the year. There was not enough collaboration and PLC work within this subject as well as new teachers to the content.

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

ELA Achievement and Math Achievement both increased by 4 percent. This was in part due to the role that coaches took in these two area. The additions of priority PLCs to dive deeper into the data was a contributing factor to the increase in these two areas.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

One area of concern is approximately 30% of our student population scored a level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Increase intentional planning for Tier II instruction through the work of the Priority PLCs
2. Increase the use of collaboration, focused note taking and critical reading with school-wide AVID strategies.
3. Increase achievement for our subgroups identified through ESSA-Blacks, ELL and SWD.
4. Continue to focus on CFA's to allow students and teachers to track standards mastery.
5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | By June 2020, 80%+ students will demonstrate mastery of standards as measured by achieving 70%+ on Common Assessments. |
| **Rationale** | If this above is achieved, it should help to decrease the number of students who are scoring level 1's on state assessments. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | After we receive the state assessment scores in June, we should see a decrease in the number of level 1's. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Tier III supports will be provided through intensive reading and critical thinking class with a focus on math. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Reading placement is determined by district guidelines. GMS chose to put struggling math students in a critical thinking class to provide additional supports in the area of math. These layered interventions provide opportunities to fill skill gaps that are unable to be addressed during a standard 50 minute period. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Identify students for placement in intensive reading.<br>2. Identify students for placement in critical thinking.<br>3. Monitoring of student progress through student intervention team.<br>4. Continuous monitoring of student gaps through Priority PLCs |
| **Person Responsible** | Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

NA