

Alachua County Public Schools

# High Springs Community 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Lynn Mcneill**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<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)	46%
<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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (67%)
<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>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

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

### 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)
Combination School PK-8	No	61%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	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 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.

High Springs Community School contributes to the improvement of self, family, community, and nation.

We are committed to the success of every student!

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

All stakeholders work collaboratively to ensure the social, emotional and academic success of each student.

### 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
McNeill, Lynn	Principal	
BISHOP, EMERY	Assistant Principal	
Roberson, Jenni	Assistant Principal	
Wenzell, Tana	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Morrison, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Butts, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Shintock, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	
Sumner, Amy		
Alleman, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Register, Loretta	Teacher, K-12	
Rendek, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Gallagher, Amy	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	93	117	107	97	113	117	127	103	109	0	0	0	0	983
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	16	13	11	11	16	4	11	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	2	3	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	2	2	8	13	22	11	6	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	21	30	26	23	26	0	0	0	0	131

#### 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	2	1	2	13	15	21	12	8	0	0	0	0	74

#### 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		1	9	2	4	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

52

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

Tuesday 9/24/2019

#### 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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	63%	65%	61%	61%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	59%	59%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	54%	48%	46%	51%
Math Achievement	69%	58%	62%	73%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	74%	59%	59%	76%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	56%	52%	68%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	60%	56%	73%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	84%	78%	86%	83%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	93 (0)	117 (0)	107 (0)	97 (0)	113 (0)	117 (0)	127 (0)	103 (0)	109 (0)	983 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ( )	12 ( )	16 ( )	13 ( )	11 ( )	11 ( )	16 ( )	4 ( )	11 ( )	95 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	22 (0)	11 (0)	6 (0)	66 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	21 (0)	30 (0)	26 (0)	23 (0)	26 (0)	131 (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
03	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
	2018	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	63%	55%	8%	56%	7%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	65%	54%	11%	52%	13%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	71%	61%	10%	56%	15%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
	2018	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
	2018	78%	61%	17%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	81%	52%	29%	55%	26%
	2018	68%	53%	15%	52%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	75%	59%	16%	54%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	58%	11%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	42%	27%	15%	46%	-4%
	2018	38%	24%	14%	45%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	55%	4%	53%	6%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	67%	54%	13%	48%	19%
	2018	66%	53%	13%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	88%	69%	19%	71%	17%
2018	84%	69%	15%	71%	13%
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	82%	56%	26%	61%	21%
2018	88%	60%	28%	62%	26%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

## 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	30	43	41	30	60	54	41	53			
BLK	32	46	42	47	69	67	19	64			
HSP	65	63	50	65	67	57	68				
MUL	76	71		90	88						
WHT	68	61	51	72	75	61	72	91	77		
FRL	45	54	46	54	66	61	47	76	73		
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	27	24	16	32	40	42	24				
BLK	29	39	34	30	41	50	25	67			
HSP	67	55	25	67	67	57	68				
MUL	58	53		79	67						
WHT	70	61	54	77	61	47	75	85	86		
FRL	53	53	41	58	54	48	59	76	81		
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	25	29	24	21	45	33					
BLK	25	40	31	31	61	64	41	80			
HSP	61	49	64	66	71	60	57				
MUL	82	80		88	67						
WHT	66	63	54	80	80	72	78	87	92		
FRL	49	57	47	59	71	69	67	86	85		

## 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	608
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	62

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	81
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	70
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	58
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.**

48% of the ELA lowest quartile made learning gains. In 2018, 45% of the ELA lowest quartile made learning gains. Although this is a 3% gain, it is still below the state average of 54%.

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

65% of the 5th and 8th graders were proficient in science. This data component is the largest drop from last year with 2018 science proficiency at 68%.

**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 ELA lowest quartile has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. HSCS with 48% making learning gains and the state average was 54%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains. In 2018, the percentage making learning gains was 59%. In 2019, the percentage making math learning gains was 74%.

HSCS has been using the Task Questioning Evidence model for math instruction K-8. Professional development for teachers began three years ago and has continued each year. Grade levels focus on "Big Rocks", or key standards that are absolutely necessary for students to master in order to be successful at the next grade level. The key standards are reviewed with grade levels above and below for meaningful vertical alignment.

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

Almost 10% of the student population fall in to the Early Warning System category for poor attendance.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ELA learning gains
3. Closing the achievement gap
4. Improving overall attendance
5. Decreasing out of school suspensions

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in the area of ELA
<b>Rationale</b>	With a heavy emphasis the last three years on improving math proficiency, HSCS made exceptional learning gains in the area of math based on the 2019 FSA results. When comparing the math proficiency to ELA proficiency, 69% of HSCS students were proficient in math versus only 63% of HSCS students being proficient in ELA. Even more significant is the difference in learning gains. 74% of HSCS students made learning gains in math based on the 2019 FSA results. However, only 59% of HSCS students made learning gains in the area of ELA. 63% of HSCS lowest quartile made learning gains in math and only 48% of HSCS lowest quartile students made learning gains in ELA. These results indicate the need for a continued emphasis on math proficiency and a more strategic emphasis on ELA proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase ELA proficiency by 3% based on the comparison of 2019 and 2020 FSA ELA results.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Lynn McNeill (mcneillm@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	A. Universal Design for Learning K-8 Teacher PLC - year long; B. Leadership Team year-long PLC focused on research-based instructional strategies in ELA, using assessment data to determine next steps for instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	A. Our main goal of this UDL study is to meet the needs of all students in general education, and inclusion classrooms, to the greatest extent possible. In order to close the achievement gap, teachers must better understand how to provide instruction in a variety of ways and allow students to demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways. Teachers will meet to go through the research-based practices associated with UDL and evaluate potential approaches to using UDL in their current classrooms. They will learn about the UDL framework and incorporate materials, techniques, and strategies for delivering instruction so that students may demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways.  B. Our main goal for our ELA Leadership Team PLC is to assist grade level teams with targeting standards and determine where instruction may need to be adjusted to maximize student achievement. Strategies and assessment data will be analyzed and shared at both the Leadership Team PLC and with grade level teams.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	A. 1. Presentation to Faculty on the benefits of UDL strategies- September 2019 2. Teacher leaders will coordinate a book study, lesson study, and training sessions for K-8 teachers 3. Lesson study will include teachers observing HSCS teachers teaching lessons that incorporate UDL strategies 4. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs observing for UDL implementation 5. Feedback will be provided to teachers regarding the use of UDL strategies B. 1. Presentation to Leadership Team - September 2019 2. Team leaders will participate in a monthly analysis of data and discussion of strategies to

increase  
achievement

3. Team leaders will lead a monthly analysis of data and discussion of strategies to  
increase  
achievement

**Person  
Responsible** Lynn McNeill (mcneillm@gm.sbac.edu)

---

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Closing the achievement gap in the area of ELA.
<b>Rationale</b>	63% of HSCS students were proficient in the area of ELA based on the 2019 FSA results. However, 32% of the African American population at HSCS were proficient in the area of ELA based on the 2019 FSA results. This is almost a 50% achievement gap between African American students and the overall HSCS student population.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	African American students at HSCS will increase proficiency in the area of ELA by 10% based on the 2020 FSA ELA results.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jenni Roberson (robersonjc@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Universal Design for Learning school-wide PLC -UDL requires teachers to present information in a variety of ways, allows students options for learning and demonstrating their knowledge, and incorporates practices that maximize student engagement. Teachers will meet to go through the research-based practices associated with UDL and evaluate potential approaches to using UDL in their current classrooms. They will learn about the UDL framework and incorporate materials, techniques, and strategies for delivering instruction so that students may demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways.</p> <p>In addition, three HSCS teachers are representing the school as Equity Mentors. Our Equity Mentors will have the following opportunities to support equity on the HSCS campus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have access to participate in our online monthly community of teachers all working on Equity efforts at their school sites through the Equity Central forum provided through Canvas.</li> <li>2. Possible two face to face district PD opportunities this school year that will pay stipends.</li> <li>3. Advocate and assist with the ESSA portion of implementation from the SIP.</li> <li>4. Communicate changes and updates of the district Equity Plan.</li> <li>5. Be provided with support from the district Equity department to assist their school site with their needs.</li> <li>6. Support from IDRA (Mr. Montemayor) with school based and district based Equity efforts.</li> <li>7. Priority placement in Equity school year and summer PD opportunities (CRT and AVID strategies for the classroom).</li> <li>8. Invitation to be a participant as a stakeholder of the district based Community Equity Committee (meets twice a year)</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Because there is a 50% achievement gap in the area of ELA proficiency between African American students at HSCS and the overall student population at HSCS, there is a strong need for research-based strategies to be implemented.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement Universal Design for Learning school-wide PLC (Year Long)</li> <li>2. Review assessment data quarterly for monitoring and adjustment purposes</li> </ol>

3. Provide professional development at faculty meetings - Done by Equity Mentors and/or guest trainers
4. Access support from the district Equity department to assist school with needs

**Person Responsible** Lynn McNeill (mcneillm@gm.sbac.edu)

---

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Reduce African American out of school suspensions by 15%
<b>Rationale</b>	Based on our data from 2019, HSCS had 20 incidents of African American out of school suspensions.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will decrease the number of incidents by 3%, not exceeding 17 out of school suspensions for African American students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Lynn McNeill (mcneillm@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>A. Suspension Wall in Leadership Team Office</p> <p>B. Restorative Practices</p> <p>A. The suspension wall gives our Leadership Team a visual representation to monitor the suspensions of this subgroup. Our goal is to not exceed 17 incidents of African American suspensions in 2019/2020 so our suspension wall has 17 sticky notes divided among the four quarters of our school year. Each time students are suspended, a sticky note is crossed off and their name is added to the back of the note. This helps us determine which students are in need of additional supports to help them stay on track and make better choices.</p> <p>B. Restorative practices are used in place of suspension and to repair relationships. These practices help students learn replacement behaviors and make better choices to remain at school to learn.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>1. September 2019 - share previous year's referral and suspension data, including African American, with faculty</p> <p>2. September 2019 - Shared reduction in suspension goals for 2019/2020 with faculty</p> <p>A. 1. Met with District Student Support Service Personnel to review school data and discuss possible strategies for reducing suspension rates - September 2019.</p> <p>2. Created suspension wall in Leadership Team office - September 2019</p> <p>3. Dean and BRT will share restorative practices with teachers at monthly faculty meetings</p> <p>B. 1. Utilize Base Curriculum and Zones of Regulation with teachers and students on a regular basis.</p> <p>2. Continue to utilize additional restorative practices with students in lieu of suspension to help build relationships and develop rapport.</p>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	EMERY BISHOP (bishopbe@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).**

## Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in the area of ELA				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0461 - High Springs Community School	Other		\$2,000.00
			Notes: CREATE project funding for UDL book study			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Closing the achievement gap in the area of ELA.				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reduce African American out of school suspensions by 15%				\$0.00
Total:						\$2,000.00