

School District of Osceola County, FL

Main Street High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Main Street High School

1100 N MAIN ST, Kissimmee, FL 34744

<http://mainstreethigh.com>

Demographics

Principal: Dwayne Stewart

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Main Street High School

1100 N MAIN ST, Kissimmee, FL 34744

<http://mainstreethigh.com>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2011-12	2009-10
Grade			I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Our mission is to provide an alternative graduation path for students who are at risk through dropout intervention services that include a self-paced quality education in a personalized environment with a focus on successful post-secondary transitions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student given the right tools, support and environment, is capable of succeeding and exceeding their expectations. With the proper resources, and the flexibility to adapt and differentiate instruction, we can consistently involve students in the learning process and provide them with the right tools to successfully transition to the next opportunity they face.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Perez, Christine	Principal	<p>Ms. Perez responsibilities involve setting clear goals, managing curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, allocating resources and evaluating teachers regularly to promote student learning and growth. Quality of instruction is the top priority for leadership team. Her responsibilities are as followed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for the day-to-day operation and management of the school; the School Leader hires, trains, evaluates and supervises the school-based faculty and staff. • Achieves predetermined objectives with and through the voluntary cooperation and effort of the faculty and staff. These objectives include enrollment, attendance, retention, credits earned, standardized testing and graduation rates. • Manages of student behavior and discipline. Maintains attractive, organized, functional, healthy, clean and safe facilities. Assumes responsibility for the health, safety and welfare of the students, employees and visitors. • Develops clearly understood procedures and provides regular drills for emergencies and disasters. • Helps to manage the relationship between the school, Edison Learning, the non-profit governance board, and the local school district. • Actively participates in community events and promotes the success of the school by developing relationships with local community, government, business and public school leaders. • Abides by and assist in implementation of all policies and procedures developed by Edison Learning and the local school and other governmental agencies. Monitors school performance data and manages all reporting needs required by Edison Learning, local, state and federal authorities, and the school governance board. • Administers of public and private grants. Appropriately works with the business and finance managers to oversee budgets and forecasting. • Manages the budget and expenditures in cooperation with Edison Learning to meet financial obligations. <p>As the School Leader, Ms Perez responsibilities involve setting clear goals, managing curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, allocating resources and evaluating teachers regularly to promote student learning and growth. Quality of instruction is the top priority for leadership team.</p> <p>Our Instructional Leadership Team is committed to the core business of teaching, learning and knowledge. Our staff members meet on a regular basis during our Professional Learning Community to discuss how to do their jobs better and ultimately help students learn more effectively.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schroeder, Ronald	Other	<p>Academic Advisor</p> <p>Responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adheres to and promote the implementation of all guidance programs. • Reviews and evaluate student transcripts. • Develops student schedules based on graduation requirements; graduate plans. • Enrolls students in the appropriate classes. • Manages and act as primary school site contact for internal student information system. • Assists students and faculty to create a Graduation Plan for each student. • Assists students with college application process. • Assists student development of post-secondary plans, employment and career programs. • Works with and support designated consultants, agencies, and/or support groups • Maintains confidentiality in all student and professional matters. • Maintains consistent contact with staff, teachers, students, families and community agents. • Markets scholarship opportunities to students; initiate partnerships with local high schools, vocational, colleges and universities. • Schedules conferences with parents and students to discuss graduation track and any other topic that relates to graduation. • Provides students with a positive role model and individual mentoring. • Conducts campus tours to ensure that school and school board policies are being enforced. Corrects non-compliance. • Manages inter-disciplinary team to ensure students are being provided with services as needed. • Provides information to the principal regarding teachers' effectiveness in classroom management and pupil control. • Participates in school-based leadership opportunities (i.e. team meeting, Lead teacher meeting, etc). • Convenes scheduled meetings with School Administration to discuss individual cases and the well-being of the student body. • Ensures teachers are organized, manage their time well and cover proper curriculum conforming to Main Street High, state and District guidelines. • Works with School Administration to observe and evaluate the classroom environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/23/2018, Dwayne Stewart

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

4

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level															Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	33	179	227		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	26	147	183		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	35		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	180	206		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	110	133		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	11	98	124		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	9	61	81		

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	1	14	33	179	227	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	53	232	314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	21	134	166
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	2	17	63	310	392
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	53	123	193

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	8	16	158	182

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	85	85
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	49

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	53	232	314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	21	134	166
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	2	17	63	310	392
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	53	123	193

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	8	16	158	182

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	85	85
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	49

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	57%	56%	0%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	48%	51%	0%	47%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	42%	0%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	46%	51%	0%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	41%	48%	0%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	45%	0%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	69%	68%	0%	71%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	8%	47%	-39%	53%	-45%
	2018	6%	49%	-43%	53%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

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	16%	62%	-46%	67%	-51%
2018	13%	68%	-55%	65%	-52%
Compare		3%			
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	38%	62%	-24%	70%	-32%
2018	18%	61%	-43%	68%	-50%
Compare		20%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
2018	7%	52%	-45%	62%	-55%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	44%	-36%	57%	-49%
2018	3%	39%	-36%	56%	-53%
Compare		5%			

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										36	
ELL										27	
BLK										40	20
HSP				8			4	22		33	20

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
WHT										52	
FRL				9			4	30		35	20
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	21
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	125
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	12
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	16
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	26
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Students at Main Street High School have had the lowest standardize tests scores in Reading. The factors that have contributed to the scores being low have been the lack of hiring a Certified and or endorsed Reading teacher. The process of not hiring a Reading teacher was not because the administration has not attempted to search for a Reading teacher instead it was due to the lack of qualified available teachers. In 2019-2020 a substitute was placed in the position of the Reading teacher.

A second factor was the absenteeism of the students. It is difficult to keep the students on track when attending a Direct Instruction. Due to the population we serve students and the culture in which they are accustom to living, school is not their highest priority, survival is. The students chose to work instead of attending school regularly. This has hindered their learning process. For a student to catch up on work missed is difficult, however when a student misses more than ten days of school and learning is not their priority making up work to learn the lessons is more of a struggle. These absences create gaps. This gaps are evident in the testing process. Which in turns leads to low scores.

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

The greatest decline was in Mathematics. This was due to students not being able to test due to the Coronavirus. During this time period students who were scheduled to test for Algebra I and Geometry could not test because the schools were closed.

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.

Biology was the subject that had the greatest gaps between the school scores and the state average. One trend that contributed to this low test score was the fact that not all students in the school year of 2019-2020 did not have an opportunity to test in the Spring semester due to the Coronavirus. However, students who initially tested in the beginning of the year were retakes. Students who completed the course later in 2019-2020 did not have an opportunity to test. In addition, taking courses from home via an online and the quick change in life style hindered the learning process of students. They no longer worked so effectively as if they were at school. The absenteeism increases.

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

Although in 2019-2020 students did not test, based on the data in 2018-2019 our students increased in test scores Mathematics. These results were due to having more staff to assisted with teaching students. We provided many Direct Instruction, face to face interaction with students in Math.

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

There are two concerns that have been mentioned for Early Warning Signs in students they are the culture of the school and absenteeism. The culture of the school had to change regarding the staff of the school. This culture was based on the staff of the school. Staffing had to change. More engaging teachers was needed. As a result students who have difficulties attending school on a regular bases

refused to come to school when the lessons being taught were not entertaining or engaging. This only lead to more students being absent. Both culture and absenteeism are a major concern to change in SY 2020-2021.

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

1. School culture is the main factor we at Main Street High School are beginning to change during the school year 2020-2021. New teachers have been hired and with the new curriculum being used for educating our students has been incorporated also to provide a more effective education.
2. Since more engaging teachers have been hired we expect attendance to increase in order to no longer have it as a problem.
3. Lastly, when more students attend school more students complete more credits and more students graduate.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Main Street High School there is a critical problem with attendance. The students who attend Main Street High School are specifically attending our school due to low credit and grade point averages that have transpired due to a lack of attendance throughout the years. Presently students attend our school on an average of 43% of the school days.
Measurable Outcome:	Main Street High School has wants to have students increase their attendance rates from the low 40's to a minimum of an average of 65% the first year and 75% the second year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Perez (cperez@mainstreethigh.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Jing Liu and Susanna Loeb's research in 2019, Engaging Teachers: Measuring the Impact of Teachers on Student Attendance in Secondary School, studied the impact of teachers and the effect on the student absenteeism. Teachers who were found to support, encourage, respect students and who were acknowledged by the students to be knowledgeable had the most students attend school more often.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Main Street High School will implant new instructional staff in order to support the needs of a well rounded student. These teachers will produce gains by increasing attendance because they will implement engagement with students individually, small group and as a whole class. These steps are not considered small yet very large in the direction a domino effect for overall student increases in all areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When reviewing the bottom line of why our students are functioning at lower averages than the state the overall student had to be looked at. In uniting a puzzle of reasons that our student scores are excessively lower than the state average, we realized it was due to their absences. Once we studied the patterns of why students are absent so much more than a traditional high school we narrowed it two to family issues and teacher engagement. Since we cannot assist directly with family difficulties we did recognize that we could work with teacher engagement. This was something based on Liu and Loeb stated that can have a massive effect on overall student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1, Hire new teachers
2. Insure teachers are passionate and highly qualified
3. Create more engaging classrooms
4. Increase attendance by engaging classes
5. Engaging class lead to more students
6. More students attending increases more completed courses
7. Which increase gains on tests and graduation rate

Person Responsible Christine Perez (cperez@mainstreethigh.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

although it may seem as if the areas of focus vary, they actually do not. They are all intertwined with the student and teacher effectiveness. As described prior all areas begin with changing the culture of the school. This begins with new teachers who want to work for this particular population of Drop Outs, At-Risk students. It then ends with the overall increase in graduation which effects the community as a whole.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Main Street High School has an environment that allows for acceptance of all students and staff. Within the doors we aim to have stakeholders become involved with all aspects of the school. Stakeholders have provided important feedback to the staff at the school that allow for external and internal views of change.

In order to be able to build on areas in which Main Street High School has gaps we have created several surveys that allow for all students, parents, guardians, staff and volunteers to provide feedback to areas in which they may feel need to be addressed. Opinions have been incorporated in which have assisted in building a stronger team and environment for students. Other suggestions have increased the amount of Direct Instructions provided to students, change in curriculum and other changes that have taken place in the past few years.

Other ways in which we have included stakeholders as part of the environment are by holding Student Advisory Council and Title I meetings. These meetings have been additional outlets for various persons to provide ideas for change. Some stakeholders have had meetings with administration and have informed and advised of changes. The administration took the information and shared it with other stakeholders to create a better school.

The environment has changed and continues to change with the input of the stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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