

Alachua County Public Schools

# Gainesville High School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Gainesville High School

1900 NW 13TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

<https://www.sbac.edu/gainesville>

## Demographics

**Principal: Daniel Ferguson**

Start Date for this Principal: 12/10/2011

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (68%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Gainesville High School

1900 NW 13TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

<https://www.sbac.edu/gainesville>

### 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)
High School 9-12	No	58%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.**

The mission of Gainesville High School is to provide students with an appreciation of their intrinsic value and to develop within them the skills, knowledge, and curiosity which will enable them to lead fulfilling and productive lives in a rapidly changing and increasingly complex society.

Beliefs:

1. Our school's priority is student learning.
2. Our students have the capacity to learn the skills and concepts necessary to become productive citizens which will enable them to become confident, self-directed, life long learners.
3. Student learning improves in a safe, comfortable environment.
4. A partnership between families, the school and community benefits all students.
5. Diversity increases students' understanding of other people and cultures.

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

Gainesville High School is committed to challenging all students to achieve their highest potential.

### 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
Shelnutt, David	Principal	Instructional Leader
Becker, Mallory	Assistant Principal	ESE, ESOL, Guidance
Hartwell, Libby	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Deans, Instructional Materials
Testa, Michael	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Hogan, April	Instructional Media	Media Specialist
Butfiloski, Carmen	School Counselor	Cambridge Coordinator
Fields, David	Teacher, K-12	US History Teacher
Forgione, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	SS Department Chair
Long, Detra	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Mercer, Kenneth	School Counselor	Cambridge Counselor
Paxson, Maggie	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Plavac, Janinie	Teacher, Career/Technical	Career and Technical Department Chair
Solito, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	English Department Chair
Montgomery, Tara	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509	525	464	450	1948
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	41	34	31	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	54	29	14	147
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	82	67	42	237
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	197	42	75	476

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	104	65	32	266

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	9	6	29
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)

87

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

Wednesday 7/24/2019

#### 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	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	26	47	52	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	31	25	35	134
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	10	24	10	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	217	0	0	398

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	110	25	30	255	

## 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	58%	59%	56%	58%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	52%	51%	56%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	39%	42%	40%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	54%	51%	51%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	54%	48%	49%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	45%	36%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	64%	68%	68%	66%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	75%	73%	71%	74%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	509 (0)	525 (0)	464 (0)	450 (0)	1948 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	42 ( )	41 ( )	34 ( )	31 ( )	148 (0)
One or more suspensions	50 (0)	54 (0)	29 (0)	14 (0)	147 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	46 (0)	82 (0)	67 (0)	42 (0)	237 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	162 (0)	197 (0)	42 (0)	75 (0)	476 (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
09	2019	56%	60%	-4%	55%	1%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	55%	0%	53%	2%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	66%	-5%	67%	-6%
2018	67%	68%	-1%	65%	2%
Compare		-6%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	71%	3%	70%	4%
2018	71%	71%	0%	68%	3%
Compare		3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	56%	-34%	61%	-39%
2018	25%	60%	-35%	62%	-37%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	48%	-2%	57%	-11%
2018	55%	63%	-8%	56%	-1%
Compare		-9%			

### 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	12	35	36	19	17		19	30		83	40
ELL	11	39	40	43	59	50	26	58		76	43
ASN	78	58	40	79	81		80	95		100	70
BLK	29	38	34	27	33	35	34	55		95	38
HSP	43	48	43	50	55	36	45	63		78	72
MUL	56	52	36	49	56		72	71		100	67
WHT	82	65	42	80	65	53	85	92		97	83
FRL	32	38	37	32	38	32	40	62		93	46
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	17	28	22	10	21	14	27	38		66	29
ELL	16	53	50	38	51	52	45	25		78	43
ASN	82	85		84	73		92	80		95	72
BLK	31	43	40	24	34	37	42	53		80	30
HSP	39	44	35	36	40	40	58	65		92	51
MUL	57	65	45	55	52		77	84		95	61
WHT	84	71	33	67	59	41	90	92		95	75
FRL	40	49	40	34	38	42	54	63		83	37
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	14	40	37	13	33	32	28	40		59	32
ELL	8	50	52	29	48	50	29	47		85	45
ASN	82	63		82	71		89	76		80	67
BLK	31	39	31	22	30	31	39	51		81	23
HSP	40	58	54	46	49	36	55	70		87	70
MUL	60	58	43	48	38	46	59	72		89	60
WHT	81	68	58	75	64	38	86	90		91	77
FRL	34	42	38	30	33	34	40	58		80	33

### 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	655
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54

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	62
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	74
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	46
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.**

The data component that shows the lowest performance is the bottom quartile ELA learning gains. Our school dropped from 40% to 38%. We attribute some of this to our large number of ESOL students, we are currently in the process of reorganizing this program with new instructors and more emphasis on increasing reading skills.

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

Our overall ELA learning gains decreased from 59% to 53%. Again, this is the same trend we see with the lowest quartile ELA learning gains. We are addressing this through our ESOL instruction as well as our Reading instruction. We have new instructors in both of these areas.

**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.**

Largest gap area is Lowest Quartile Math gains. State is at 45%, GHS is at 40%. This continues to be an area of focus, especially in Algebra 1.

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

Math achievement in general showed the most improvement, going from 46% to 55%. Implementing informal geometry has helped contribute to the success our students are showing on the Geometry EOC.

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

Areas of concern: Current 10th grade students have the highest suspension rates and the highest number of failed courses.

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

1. Student Safety
2. Closing the Achievement gap
3. Reducing the number of suspensions (all students and AA students.)
4. Graduation Rate
5. ESSA - Increase the achievement rate of SWD subgroup

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Decrease the number of out of School suspension for all and for AA students.
<b>Rationale</b>	Fewer suspensions result in more time spent in class engaged in instructional activities.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	GHS will decrease suspensions by 5% for all students and 15% for all African American Students as compared to 2018-19 Target for overall suspensions is no more than 290 Target for AA suspensions is no more than 192
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Restorative practices will be employed for each referral
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Restorative practices aim to find ways to keep students in school while providing them with opportunities to receive counseling or education related to the offense.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One restorative practice action is given for each offence</li> <li>2. Use of the BASE SEL program to pinpoint the SEL topic to the offence.</li> <li>3. Use of Student of the Week positive behavior program school wide.</li> <li>4. Lower the number of days out of school when a student does receive a suspension.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Graduation Rate of ELL students
<b>Rationale</b>	Our ELL graduation rate decreased from 78% in 17-18 to 76% in 18-19. As the ESOL Center high school, GHS is working on ways to significantly increase
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	GHS will increase graduation rate by 5% over the 18-19 rate. Target is a grad rate of 81%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Frequent meeting and planning with counselors and ESOL home liason
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Counselors meet frequently with students who may be credit deficient to keep them motivated and to find ways to get them back on track or the keep them on track.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meeting with counselors/parents</li> <li>2. CROP offered during school and after school</li> <li>3. JFG Jobs for Florida Graduatess</li> <li>4. Additional ESOL paras have been hired</li> <li>5. Specialist to tutor ACT and SAT strategies</li> <li>6. Work with ESOL Home Liason to keep parents informed of progress</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increasing the Gains of the lowest quartile.
<b>Rationale</b>	Currently the learning gains of our lowest quartile in ELA is 38%, in Math 40%
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	GHS will in crease the learning gains of our lowest quartile students by 10% in ELA and Math. Targets will be 48% in ELA and 40% in Math
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michael Testa (testama@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Struggling math students are given an extra year of math instruction prior to taking the Alg. 1 EOC as well as other supports in both Math and ELA
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Struggling math students are given an extra year of math instruction prior to taking the Alg. 1 EOC as well as other supports in both Math and ELA.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Liberal Arts Math prior to taking Algebra 1</li> <li>2. Free tutoring by certified teachers offered three afternoons a week.</li> <li>3. ELA boot camps offered prior to FSA testing.</li> <li>4. Intensive reading classes for level one students.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michael Testa (testama@gm.sbac.edu)

#4	
<b>Title</b>	ESSA subgroup - Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	Students with Disabilities subgroup at 32% achievement
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	GHS will raise the percent of achievement based on the FSA to 41% for students with disabilities.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Support Facilitation.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students with Disabilities who are struggling will be placed in a support facilitation cohort. One ESE teacher travels with each grade level co-hort to each of the academic courses for the group. The co-hort also has a learning strategies class with the same ESE teacher.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cohort Support Facilitation classes</li> <li>2. Learning Strategies classes</li> <li>3. Free after school tutoring.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu)

#5	
<b>Title</b>	Increase the achievement of AA students
<b>Rationale</b>	AA students' achievement level for ELA decreased from 31% in 2018 to 29% in 2019 AA students' achievement level for Math increased slightly from 24 in 2018 to 27% in 2019
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Achievement levels for AA students in both ELA and Math will increase to 41% in 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michael Testa (testama@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Learning Strategies classes for most level 1 and 2 students in this subgroup
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Most of our lower achieving AA students are also identified as ESE students. These students are placed in a cohort that travels with an ESE teacher to all academic classes as well as spending one period a day in a learning strategies class to work on homework, test taking strategies and reading comprehension skills.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Liberal Arts Math prior to taking Algebra 1</li> <li>2. Free tutoring by certified teachers offered three afternoons a week.</li> <li>3. ELA boot camps offered prior to FSA testing.</li> <li>4. Intensive reading classes for level one students</li> <li>5. Support facilitation for the ESE students</li> <li>6. Learning Strategies classes.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu)

### 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).**

#### School Safety

The following have been put into place in order to increase the level of safety of our school.

1. Camera surveillance of campus perimeter - monitored at 11 work stations.
2. Additional gates provided by district to more fully enclose the campus
3. Single point of entry - public doors at the south end of the administrative complex have been locked and traffic redirected to the main office.
4. Classroom doors locked at all times.
5. Monthly ALICE drills
6. YMHFA training for all administrators, deans and counselors. Cognito training for all staff.
7. Collaboration with Law Enforcement/ Gainesville Fire and Rescue for responding to an emergency.