

Marion County Public Schools

West Port 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

West Port High School

3733 SW 80TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34481

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ginger Cruze

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 85% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

West Port High School

3733 SW 80TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34481

[no web address on file]

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 | 53% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

West Port High School cultivates success in a safe environment and positive school culture, which is strengthened by rigorous academics, student and teacher relationships, and supported by family and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

West Port is an innovative center of excellence inspiring student success.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Cruze, Ginger | Principal | Lead, supervise and facilitate the overall operation of a school focusing on academic leadership. |
| Baker, Jo | Other | Testing coordinator |
| Craig, Vicki | Teacher, K-12 | Activities Director and teacher |
| Livengood, Lyle | Other | Athletic Director |
| Reeder, Laurie | Teacher, K-12 | Magnet Coordinator and teacher |
| Toomey, Jennifer | Dean | 10th grade Dean, ITD Leader and SAC member |
| Williams, Bo | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Curriculum |
| Catalfamo, Frank | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Instruction |
| Wilson, Emily | Instructional Media | Media Specialist |
| Smith, Stephanie | School Counselor | Lead counselor and Early College Coordinator |
| Umholtz, Sarah | Other | 11th Grade Dean, Lead Dean and AVID Site Team member |
| Bender, Luke | Dean | 12th Grade Dean and Senior Class Sponsor |
| McCarter, Barry | Dean | 9th Grade Dean McCarter |
| Davis, Terrell | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Student Services |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/16/2017, Ginger Cruze

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.*

5

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

124

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) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 85% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&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 | 0 | 714 | 699 | 671 | 619 | 2703 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 114 | 146 | 142 | 516 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 78 | 76 | 59 | 307 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 158 | 172 | 136 | 502 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 158 | 172 | 136 | 502 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 260 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 322 |

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 | 41 | 89 | 114 | 96 | 340 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/16/2020

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 | 0 | 649 | 636 | 650 | 621 | 2556 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 121 | 131 | 149 | 501 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 103 | 99 | 47 | 337 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 70 | 90 | 104 | 267 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 235 | 174 | 86 | 711 |

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 | 321 | 298 | 253 | 278 | 1150 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 8 | 24 | 26 | 81 |

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 | 649 | 636 | 650 | 621 | 2556 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 121 | 131 | 149 | 501 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 103 | 99 | 47 | 337 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 70 | 90 | 104 | 267 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 235 | 174 | 86 | 711 |

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 | 321 | 298 | 253 | 278 | 1150 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 8 | 24 | 26 | 81 |

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 | 59% | 46% | 56% | 55% | 43% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 48% | 51% | 49% | 46% | 49% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 39% | 42% | 35% | 40% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 40% | 51% | 49% | 37% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | 43% | 48% | 44% | 38% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | 37% | 45% | 34% | 37% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | 61% | 68% | 73% | 59% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 81% | 71% | 73% | 80% | 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 | 58% | 50% | 8% | 55% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 46% | 9% | 53% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 57% | 46% | 11% | 53% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 46% | 5% | 53% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| 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 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 67% | 2% |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 72% | 61% | 11% | 65% | 7% |
| 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 | 79% | 70% | 9% | 70% | 9% |
| 2018 | 75% | 69% | 6% | 68% | 7% |
| Compare | | 4% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 61% | -21% |
| 2018 | 50% | 57% | -7% | 62% | -12% |
| Compare | | -10% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 56% | 51% | 5% | 57% | -1% |
| 2018 | 56% | 54% | 2% | 56% | 0% |
| 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 | 23 | 34 | 32 | 23 | 43 | 37 | 43 | 42 | | 97 | 13 |
| ELL | 32 | 48 | 41 | 36 | 35 | 26 | 43 | 57 | | 96 | 35 |
| AMI | 64 | 55 | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 71 | | 76 | 75 | | 92 | 100 | | 100 | 57 |
| BLK | 45 | 49 | 42 | 40 | 41 | 23 | 61 | 67 | | 96 | 40 |
| HSP | 56 | 56 | 42 | 50 | 44 | 28 | 69 | 77 | | 98 | 52 |
| MUL | 59 | 59 | 50 | 49 | 50 | | 73 | 88 | | 94 | 53 |
| WHT | 67 | 57 | 46 | 57 | 50 | 48 | 78 | 91 | | 99 | 53 |
| FRL | 52 | 53 | 43 | 46 | 45 | 34 | 65 | 74 | | 97 | 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 | 35 | 21 | 28 | 21 | 34 | 27 | | 80 | 13 |
| ELL | 8 | 27 | 24 | 31 | 32 | 20 | 36 | 29 | | 93 | 23 |
| ASN | 66 | 52 | | 75 | 58 | | 83 | 64 | | 100 | 65 |
| BLK | 46 | 50 | 38 | 41 | 43 | 30 | 62 | 66 | | 95 | 33 |
| HSP | 49 | 45 | 36 | 50 | 49 | 28 | 67 | 70 | | 93 | 42 |
| MUL | 66 | 53 | 36 | 59 | 48 | | 71 | 86 | | 93 | 39 |
| WHT | 61 | 51 | 40 | 63 | 60 | 39 | 83 | 87 | | 94 | 54 |
| FRL | 47 | 46 | 34 | 48 | 48 | 30 | 67 | 72 | | 93 | 37 |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 16 | 24 | 18 | 18 | 30 | 30 | 36 | 46 | | 88 | 14 |
| ELL | 15 | 32 | 32 | 35 | 38 | 39 | 36 | 33 | | 90 | 44 |
| ASN | 65 | 52 | | 63 | 56 | | | 81 | | 100 | 75 |
| BLK | 46 | 42 | 39 | 36 | 41 | 35 | 59 | 74 | | 92 | 33 |
| HSP | 50 | 46 | 30 | 47 | 41 | 33 | 68 | 73 | | 97 | 56 |
| MUL | 67 | 51 | | 52 | 45 | 18 | 96 | 83 | | 97 | 53 |
| WHT | 61 | 55 | 39 | 55 | 48 | 37 | 81 | 88 | | 99 | 56 |
| FRL | 47 | 44 | 32 | 43 | 40 | 32 | 65 | 75 | | 96 | 50 |

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 | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 652 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | 60 |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 80 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 50 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 58 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 64 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 56 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data utilized was the 2018-19 data which showed the lowest performance category was the lowest 25th percentile in math at 35%. We have performed low in this category for the past few years however, we did increase by 2 percentage points in 2018-19 and continue to put strategies and support in place to remedy this.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math Learning Gains which declined from 54% to 47%. This decline was a result of students who were tested from one year to the next.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the lowest 25% in math. We adjusted the way we taught the Algebra 1a/1b and we have continued to make refinements in our teaching methods and strategies.

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 ELA Learning Gains. We continued to focus on collaborative planning, review of PSAT data, and standards based instruction.

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

Two areas of concern from this year's EWS are one or more suspensions and students with two or more EWS indicators.

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

1. Focus on rigorous, standards-based instruction with a school wide focus on AVID WICOR strategies.
2. Focus on course based collaboration and planning for face-to-face and MCPSONline instruction.
3. Focus on technology training to assist students with online learning.
4. Utilize teacher made, collaborative assessments to help drive instruction in math and ELA.
5. Refocus PLCs to look at assessment and classwork.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Increase performance in ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Learning Gains of the bottom 25%. Students increased from 55% to 59% in ELA Achievement, 49% to 56% in ELA learning Gains, and 37% to 44% in Learning Gains of the bottom 25% from 2017-18 to 2018-19. We did not test last year. |
| Measurable Outcome: | If teachers collaboratively plan using standards-based instruction and utilize AVID's WICOR strategies which include Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading in every class, every day monitoring with formative assessments in all classes along with ELA developed assessments in all English classes, students will increase in ELA Achievement from 59% to 64%, ELA Learning Gains from 56% to 61% and ELA Learning Gains of the bottom 25% from 44% to 50%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Ginger Cruze (ginger.cruze@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Students will Write, Inquire, Collaborate, Organize and Read in every class, every day. Teachers will instruct utilizing standards-based instruction and will monitor learning with formative assessments. English teachers developed department wide monitoring methods for ELA. Teachers will share in collaborative planning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers and students will work together with familiar evidence-based strategies and monitor their learning. This will allow for remediation for deficits and enrichment for assets. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will use rigorous standards-based instruction utilizing technology through chromebooks and flat screens to enhance instruction.
2. Teachers will utilize WICOR and CAR PD Instructional Strategies in their instruction.
3. Administrators will collaborate on walk-through data and learning walks with teachers.
4. Teachers will collaborate through the PLC Process through book studies and use of additional library books focused on formative assessments and classwork.
5. Student success will be enhanced with the use of Reading Plus and Sound Reading will be utilized for striving readers along with after school tutoring.
6. Additional support staff through the Intervention Teacher and Career Lab Specialist will help improve student learning and success along with future goals through enrollment, enlistment or employment.
7. Students with Disabilities will receive support in ELA through after school tutoring and assistance from the Intervention Teacher.

Person Responsible Ginger Cruze (ginger.cruze@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase performance in Math Achievement, learning Gains, and Learning Gains of the bottom 25%. Students decreased 55% to 51% in Math Achievement, 54% to 47% in Math Learning Gains and 33% to 35% in Learning Gains of the bottom 25% from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers collaboratively plan and use standards-based instruction using AVID's WICOR strategies along with real world problems to learn math, monitoring learning with formative assessments which were developed over the summer, then students will increase in Math Achievement from 51% to 54%, Math Learning Gains from 47% to 50% and Math Learning Gains of the bottom 25% from 35% to 38%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bo Williams (reuben.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will use standards-based, real world problems to learn math. Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies specifically for math instruction and monitor the learning through subject developed formative assessments. Teachers will collaborate on best practices using collaborative planning and evaluation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students must master the standards to improve their understanding of the required concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will instruct using standard-based, rigorous instruction utilizing technology through chromebooks and flat screens to enhance instruction.
2. Teacher developed formative assessments will be utilized and analyzed during PLCs along with book studies to develop rigorous instructional methods in math.
3. Administrators will perform walkthroughs and provide feedback to monitor instructional practices.
4. Math Instructional Coach will work with teachers that need additional assistance.
5. Math 180 will be incorporated into the Algebra 1A instruction.
6. Administrators will collaboration on walk-through data and learning walks with teachers.
7. Additional support staff through the Intervention Teacher and Career Lab Specialist will help improve student learning and success along with future goals through enrollment, enlistment or employment.
7. Students with Disabilities will receive support in ELA through after school tutoring and assistance from the Intervention Teacher.

Person Responsible Bo Williams (reuben.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The administrators and the leadership team will work together on the school wide focus of collaboration in incorporating AVID schoolwide. In addition, we will work to make sure our traditional and MCPSONline delivery provide the same rigorous instruction for our students focusing on technology training, incorporating WICOR and CAR PD Strategies and continuous collaboration at the course, department and school levels.

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.

West Port High School has a positive school culture which includes strong relationships with all stakeholders, has strong values including trust, respect and high expectations for all students. West Port's four magnet programs along with our various variety of programs offered allow students to be engaged in their learning. West Port's School Advisory Council shares in the positive culture and environment. In addition, various booster clubs and parent groups are willing to work with our school by providing services while we listen to their suggestions and concerns. West Port's Admin supports a positive culture/ environment by providing teachers the opportunity to voice their opinions, try new strategies, collaborate with colleagues and work as a team.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |