

Alachua County Public Schools

# Professional Academy Magnet At Lofton High



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>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>18</b> |

# Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

3000 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kristopher Bracewell**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2013

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 50%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (66%)<br>2017-18: B (61%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: B (60%)<br>2014-15: B (61%)  |
| <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>   | 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 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>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>18</b> |

## Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

3000 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | No                     | 62%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 44%  |

### School Grades History

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

Every student, every day .... engaged and experiencing success!

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

A vital community united as the premier provider of career and technical education.

We believe that the Professional Academies Magnet at Lofton High School is a place where every student:

- \* is known by name
- \* can belong to a group and be part of something special
- \* wants to come to school because he or she is involved in doing important things
- \* is motivated to achieve at high levels in all program clusters
- \* has his/her needs met by a staff that works as a united team
- \* experiences the connection between community and school

### 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  |
|------------------|------------------------|--|
| McElroy, William | Principal              | Master schedule, data analysis, student supervision, all others                  |
| Allen, Cheryl    | Assistant Principal    | Testing, schedules, parents, IEP and 504 meetings, all others duties as assigned |
| Boria, Rikki     | Teacher, K-12          | Literacy Chairperson   |
| Middleton, Dedra | Administrative Support | As assigned  |

### 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 | 81 | 74 | 61 | 57 | 273 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 4  | 11 | 10 | 30  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 4  | 2  | 4  | 13  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 6  | 9  | 7  | 30  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 9  | 7  | 56  |       |

**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 | 8 | 6  | 9  | 3  | 26    |

**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 | 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)**

16

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

Tuesday 8/27/2019

**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             | 65%    | 59%      | 56%   | 57%    | 57%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    | 52%      | 51%   | 47%    | 54%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 49%    | 39%      | 42%   | 41%    | 42%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 63%    | 54%      | 51%   | 42%    | 47%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 57%    | 54%      | 48%   | 32%    | 41%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64%    | 48%      | 45%   | 25%    | 32%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 80%    | 68%      | 68%   | 63%    | 65%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 72%    | 75%      | 73%   | 74%    | 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     | 81 (0)                            | 74 (0) | 61 (0) | 57 (0) | 273 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 5 ( )                             | 4 ( )  | 11 ( ) | 10 ( ) | 30 (0)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 3 (0)                             | 4 (0)  | 2 (0)  | 4 (0)  | 13 (0)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 8 (0)                             | 6 (0)  | 9 (0)  | 7 (0)  | 30 (0)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 27 (0)                            | 13 (0) | 9 (0)  | 7 (0)  | 56 (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 | 68%    | 60%      | 8%                         | 55%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 68%    | 58%      | 10%                        | 53%   | 15%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 63%    | 55%      | 8%                         | 53%   | 10%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 60%    | 60%      | 0%                         | 53%   | 7%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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        | 81%    | 66%      | 15%                   | 67%   | 14%                |
| 2018        | 87%    | 68%      | 19%                   | 65%   | 22%                |
| 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        | 71%    | 71%      | 0%                    | 70%   | 1%                 |
| 2018        | 69%    | 71%      | -2%                   | 68%   | 1%                 |
| Compare     |        | 2%       |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 50%    | 56%      | -6%                   | 61%   | -11%               |
| 2018        | 55%    | 60%      | -5%                   | 62%   | -7%                |
| Compare     |        | -5%      |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 96%    | 48%      | 48%                   | 57%   | 39%                |
| 2018         | 52%    | 63%      | -11%                  | 56%   | -4%                |
| Compare      |        | 44%      |                       |       |                    |

### 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                                       | 16       | 37     | 36          | 35        | 50      |              |          | 30      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 41       | 46     | 18          | 41        | 62      |              | 47       | 56      |           | 95                | 16                  |
| HSP                                       | 76       | 71     |             | 55        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 59     | 50          | 70        | 57      | 56           | 94       | 93      |           | 100               | 74                  |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 48     | 47          | 59        | 56      | 58           | 75       | 59      |           | 92                | 48                  |
| 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                                       | 21       | 37     | 29          |           |         |              | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 49     | 35          | 40        | 27      |              | 67       | 36      |           | 88                | 47                  |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 67     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 59     |             | 76        | 44      |              | 87       | 96      |           | 100               | 78                  |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 54     | 40          | 60        | 38      | 25           | 65       | 60      |           | 96                | 50                  |
| 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                                       | 21       | 26     | 15          | 12        | 13      |              |          |         |           | 67                |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 41     | 43          | 18        | 17      | 6            | 35       | 53      |           | 68                | 35                  |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 46     |             | 43        | 21      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       |          |        |             | 20        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 76       | 52     | 36          | 58        | 43      | 44           | 79       | 82      |           | 94                | 75                  |
| FRL                                       | 43       | 43     | 43          | 32        | 27      | 14           | 55       | 66      |           | 69                | 39                  |

### 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         | 66   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1    |

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 663 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 34  |
| 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                                       |     |
| 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                                 | 47  |
| 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   | 67  |
| 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   | 65  |
| 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   | 73  |
| 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                                | 60  |
| 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.**

SWD students in ELA showed the lowest performance. The biggest contributing factor was attendance for these students.

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

Math scores for white students showed the largest drop of all data points. Again, we found that attendance was the biggest issue along with a gap in instruction on our block schedule.

**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 Algebra EOC scores showed the largest gap. This was not the case in previous years. The difference was that we increased the class size in 19-19 but have now split those students in two sections, year long for 19-20.

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

The geometry scores saw the biggest jump as we offered it in the fall term as opposed to the spring term. There was not a large gap in instruction.

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

Attendance and level 1 students.

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

1. Students with disabilities, ELA and math
2. Students with level 1 on ELA and/or math
3. Attendance for all students
4. Students who fail one or more ELA or math course
5. Gain scores in ELA and math for lowest 25%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Students with disabilities ELA   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | This number of SWD students who passed the FSA ELA assessment decreased by 5 percentage points.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase the passing rate on the FSA ELA assessment for students with disabilities by 3%   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Schedule all level 1 and 2 SWD students in year-long language arts and reading instruction.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Our SWD students showed the largest drop in the FSA ELA passing rate. There were also the only subgroup that did not meet the baseline federal percent of points index.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify SWD students who did not make a passing score on most recent FSA ELA assessment</li> <li>2. Place identified students in year-long ELA and reading instruction, both fall and spring term on the block schedule</li> <li>3. Schedule and IEP permitting, place identified students in a section of Learning Strategies for additional academic support in either the fall or spring term, or both.</li> <li>4. Use FSA and AIMS data to identify specific areas to target for remediation.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#2</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Student on FRL ELA gain scores  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | ELA gain scores for FRL students fell by 6 percentage points.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | ELA gain scores for FRL students will increase by 5 percentage points.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Identified students will be placed in year-long ELA and reading instruction to avoid a gap in instruction. Students will also attend after-school tutoring or be pulled out of an elective period for one-on-one remediation.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Our FRL students were the only subgroup which had a decrease in gain scores.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify FRL students who did not make a gain on most recent FSA ELA assessment from the previous year</li> <li>2. Place identified students in year-long ELA and reading instruction, both fall and spring term on the block schedule</li> <li>3. Use FSA and AIMS data to identify specific areas to target for remediation.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)   |
| <b>#3</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Students with level 1 on ELA or Math  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Early Warning Sign (EWS) data indicated students with a level 1 on a state-administered assessment was the largest group.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | 50 % of these students will increase their achievement level in either math or ELA.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | All level one ELA and math students will be placed in year-long mathematics and/or ELA-reading instruction on the block schedule  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | To avoid any gaps in ELA or math instruction. This was the most pressing EWS data point to address.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify all level 1 math and ELA students</li> <li>2. Schedule students for double time, year-long instruction in smaller classes.</li> <li>3. Utilize FSA and AIMS data to differentiate instruction</li> <li>4. Monitor subsequent test scores.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)   |

| #4  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Math and ELA Achievement gap  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Although our math gap decreased by 16 % and ELA gap decreased by 7 %, we want to get both to zero.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Decrease the math and ELA achievement gap by 5%   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | [no one identified]   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | All level 1 and 2 students will take an extra math or ELA course during the 19-20 school year.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The extra math and/or ELA course will provide a year-long learning experience and double the instructional time for our lowest level minority students.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify all students of color who are at level 1 in ELA and/or mathematics</li> <li>2. Schedule students in year-long math and/or ELA.</li> <li>3. Analyze specific data to identify deficiencies</li> <li>4. Design instruction based on data analysis.</li> <li>5. Conduct periodic meetings for updates on performance and re-mediate as necessary</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)  |



| #5  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Minority enrollment in Career Academies  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Increase the number of minority students who attend one of the five Career Academies   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase the diversity in all Academies by 2%.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Identify minority students early in their 8th grade year and increase the number who are exposed to the various Career Academies at Lofton. Continue to use the lottery system to provide additional opportunities for minority students.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The percentage of minority students is less than that of non-minority students in CTE Academy programs at Lofton .   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collect data on the percentage of minority students in each Career Academy at Lofton.</li> <li>2. Reach out to 8th grade minority students to attend the CTE forum at BHS on November 14, 2019</li> <li>3. Reach out to 8th grade minority students to attend the CTE forum at PAM@LHS on January 9, 2020.</li> <li>4. Implement the lottery process with fidelity.</li> <li>5. Implement strategies to retain minority students in CTE programs.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | William McElroy (mcelroywc@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).**

Career and acceleration and graduation rate data decreased from the previous year so we are making that a school focus for the 19-20 school year. Student transcripts and current schedules are being reviewed to determine which students have not received the acceleration credit.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

N/A

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

N/A

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

N/A

## Part V: Budget

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

|               |        |   |               |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Students with disabilities ELA          | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Student on FRL ELA gain scores          | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Students with level 1 on ELA or Math    | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math and ELA Achievement gap            | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Minority enrollment in Career Academies | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |