Auburndale Senior High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Auburndale Senior High School

1 BLOODHOUND TRL, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://www.auburndalehighschool.com/

Demographics

Principal: Todd Bennett   Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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

Auburndale Senior High School

1 BLOODHOUND TRL, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://www.auburndalehighschool.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 PK, 9-12	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Auburndale High School is to prepare our students to become successful in college, career, and citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Auburndale High School is to create an extraordinary environment that inspires greatness.

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
Bruno, Tye	Principal	
Mills, Jenn	Assistant Principal	
Wilder, Tyrone	Assistant Principal	
Portillo, Ismael	Assistant Principal	
Lancaster, Pam	Dean	
Schneider, Carrie	Assistant Principal	
Giles, Joslyn	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Hilton, Leslie	Instructional Coach	
Marazzi, Alison	Instructional Coach	
Graham, Lindsey	Dean	Dean and Title I Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/1/2018, Todd Bennett

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.*
0

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
87

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	415	426	384	356	1581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	73	75	73	270
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	98	59	46	293
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	94	40	152
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	104	34	167

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	109	108	76	64	357

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	35	17	5	12	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	9	17	68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/2/2020

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	421	432	430	350	1633
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	57	78	61	245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	73	49	30	219
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191	176	167	142	676

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	70	72	65	45	252

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	79	91	88	65	323
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	6	5	29

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	421	432	430	350	1633
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	57	78	61	245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	73	49	30	219
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191	176	167	142	676

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	70	72	65	45	252

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	79	91	88	65	323
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	6	5	29

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	37%	47%	56%	38%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	46%	51%	43%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	37%	42%	39%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	44%	43%	51%	29%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	55%	45%	48%	33%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	44%	45%	36%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	46%	58%	68%	50%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	61%	73%	58%	60%	70%

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey (table title)

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	39%	45%	-6%	55%	-16%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	34%	42%	-8%	53%	-19%
	2018	34%	42%	-8%	53%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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	43%	54%	-11%	67%	-24%
2018	47%	59%	-12%	65%	-18%
Compare		-4%			

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	61%	57%	4%	70%	-9%
2018	45%	57%	-12%	68%	-23%
Compare		16%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	50%	-19%	61%	-30%
2018	35%	60%	-25%	62%	-27%
Compare		-4%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	53%	-2%	57%	-6%
2018	34%	41%	-7%	56%	-22%
Compare		17%			

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	18	28	23	36	69	67	26	55		78	11
ELL	9	26	35	7			25	25		73	50
BLK	23	32	30	31	47	40	29	55		89	57
HSP	34	40	29	38	64	58	40	56		84	60
MUL	39	41		73	54		69	67			
WHT	45	43	19	51	56	67	54	67		86	62
FRL	25	32	24	35	51	50	39	55		83	54

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	23	36	31	26	47	42	33	33		75	43
ELL	16	48	48	18	26	10	18	19		78	67
ASN	40										
BLK	25	38	34	23	29	33	36	30		84	62
HSP	37	42	32	39	35	17	45	49		80	69
MUL	31	42		23	33		40				
WHT	42	47	42	41	41	38	56	55		85	69
FRL	32	40	36	33	36	32	41	44		80	65

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	10	29	22	8	33	33	24	28		63	21
ELL	6	19	26	7	38	43	14	25		79	45
BLK	22	35	33	15	28	34	35	46		75	41
HSP	35	38	38	24	29	39	48	56		83	67
MUL	44	40		20	37		40	67			
WHT	44	49	43	36	35	34	56	63		79	61
FRL	29	39	38	22	31	37	38	50		74	47

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	50
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	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	42
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	49
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	57
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	55
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	43
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 component that showed the lowest performance was ELA. From our 9th and 10th graders that completed progress monitoring (2019-2020, 3rd quarter district quarterly assessments), 34% of those tested scored a level 1. In 2018-2019, 37% of our 9th and 10th graders scored a level 1 in ELA. The data for the current year does not include ELA FSA test scores as students did not particpate in FSA testing. Therefore, quarterly assessment data was also utilized as an additional data source.

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 is ELA, specificially Learning Gains (44% to 40%) and Lowest 25th Percentile (37% to 26%). Factors that contributed to this decline are poor student attendance and high number of discipline referrals.

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 is Science Achievement (Biology EOC, with AHS at 46% proficient and the state at 68% proficient). Factors that contributed towards this trend are poor student attendance and high number of discipline referrals.

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 improving US History proficiency.
Actions that our school took in this area include:
Common planning, with monitoring and support by administration.
Utilizing formative assessments and analyzed data to drive instruction (reteaching).
Provided reading support for U.S. History teachers, focused on non-fiction text.
Utilization of LSI framework for instruction.

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

Two areas of potential concern are the number of students that earned a Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment and the number of students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Improving ELA proficiency
2. ELL students
3. Discipline (Choice Room visits)
4. Diversity Compliance (Initially, we were below 5%, but after the fall report, were increased our area to above 5%)
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data component that showed the lowest performance in 2018-2019 is ELA, with 37% of our students being proficient in ELA. Data from our high needs subgroup (ELL subgroup) also showed that in 2018, 16% of ELL students were proficient in ELA, which decreased to 9% proficient in 2019. In ELA, The federal index for our ELL students was 32, which needs to be increased to 41.
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2018-2019, 37% of our 9th and 10th graders were proficient in FSA English Language Arts. The desired outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase the number of proficient 9th and 10th graders to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie Hilton (leslie.hilton@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	STAR assessments, LSI, WICOR strategies, and writing progress monitoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies were selected because they are aligned with our district goals. Our school data shows only 37% of our students are proficient with reading and literacy skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-based coaches will provide reading support for all staff based on determined needs through common planning and PLC
2. Students will complete quarterly assessments to guide instruction
3. Common planing will be utilized to create target instruction lessons and in ELA and Reading to meet the needs of all students at all levels
4. Utilization of district learning maps and pacing guides and resources
5. Common board configurations for all classrooms
6. Administration will complete classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan checks, and review student test data to ensure students are making adequate progress
7. LY students will be placed in a sheltered Reading class
8. WICOR and LSI strategies will be used across content in all classes
9. Technology such as Smart Boards and laptops will be utilized to supplement learning.
10. District PD will be used to support teacher development and guide instructional activities

Person Responsible	Carrie Schneider (carrie.schneider@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the following data: The proficiency of ELL students in 2019 was 32%, whichi is below the target of 41%. In 2018, the ELL subgroup earned the following: ELA Achievement 16% proficient, Algebra/Geometry Achievement 18% proficient, Biology 18% proficient, and US History 19% proficient. In 2019, the ELL subgroup earned the following: ELA Achievement 9% proficient (decrease by 7%), Algebra/Geometry Achievement 7% proficient (decrease by 11%), Biology 25% proficient (increase by 7%), and US History 25% proficient (increase by 6%). This area of focus impacts student learning because this is a subgroup that is not making adequate progress as observed by comparing the 2018 and 2019 school grade components by subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	The desired outcome for the Area of Focus is that English Language Learners will increase proficiency from 32% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ismael Portillo (ismael.portillo@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be identified based on state and district assessments, WIDA test history, MTSS, and EWS data. The MTSS team will monitor the indicators and provide interventions to improve learning for the subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies were selected because they are aligned with our district goals. Such data includes data specific to the English Language Learner students such as WIDA test history, state and district test history, MTSS, and EWS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. MTSS team will identify at-risk students and provide intervention.
2. LY students will be placed in a sheltered Reading class.
3, Common planning will be utilized to create target instruction lessons in ELA and Reading to meet the needs of LY students.
4. ESOL teacher will check-in at least monthly with classroom teachers of LY students concerning grades, progress, and student needs.
5. Testing Coordinator will ensure LY students receive appropriate accomodations during state and district testing.
6. Reading and math coach will coordinate to assist LY students based on needs, in collaboration with classroom and ESOL teacher
7. LY students will participate in college and career exploration, including field trips for exposure to post-secondary opportunities.
8. Special activity supples will be purchased to support family and parent engagement activities.
9. Instructional technology will be utilized as needed to assist with classroom instruction in the ESOL classroom.

Person Responsible	Ismael Portillo (ismael.portillo@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the Area of Focus related to discipline, we will reduce the total number of choice room visits, schoolwide. Our progressive discipline plan includes a series of interventions designed to reinforce the school-wide expectations for students to be on time, dressed for success, and focused on learning. Students that chose to not abide by these keys to success are sent to the Choice Room for the duration of the class period. Choice room visits are assigned a consequence following progressive discipline measures. This area was chosen as a focus based on the following data: In 2019-2020, there were 839 student visits to the Choice Room for Quarter 1, 873 visits for Quarter 2, and 861 visits in Quarter 3. The majority of the Choice Room visits for each quarter were due to tardy (55% for Quarter 1, 56% for Quarter 2, and 51% for Quarter 3). In 2019-2020, there were 290 students with one or more suspensions.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 (Q1, Q2, and Q3), we averaged 857 Choice Room vists each quarter. For the 2020-2020 school year, we would like to decrease this number by 5% to an average of 814 Choice Room visits each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tyrone Wilder (tyrone.wilder@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of the Check and Connect Mentor Program, EWS, discipline data, and progressive discipline practices to drive the MTSS processess and procedures.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Choice Room is intentded to serve as part of our progressive discipline plan, with the goal being that students make positive choices to avoid being sent to the Choice Room. When a student is not in the classroom, they miss instructional time. By utilizing MTSS, students will receive targeted instruction and support to encourage positive choices, thus decreasing the number of school-wide Choice Room visits and decreasing instructional time lost.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will be provided with information about district discipline policies, progressive discipline, and school-specific discipline policies such as the Choice Room.
2.. Behavior Interventionist will work with staff members to analyze, problem-solve, and create a level of support to assist in improving specifed student behavior.
2. Students and parents will be provided information concering the Choice Room as a means of progressive discipline. Families will be provided with an overview of the Choice Room procedures.
3. Based on discipline and Choice Room data, the MTSS team will identify students that need targeted intervention.
4. The leadership team will explore various rewards systems (such as PBIS) for selection and school-wide implemention.
5. Student incentives will be purchased, as well as field trips planned as part of student incentives.

Person Responsible	Tyrone Wilder (tyrone.wilder@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The two areas of potential concern listed in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/Analysis are the number of students that earned a Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment and the number of students with one or more suspensions. The leadership team has created an Area of Focus related to improving culture and environment, as well as improving instructional practice related to ELA.

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.

Auburndale High School works diligently to build positive relationships with all stakeholders that are involved at the school level. Our mission and vision is communicated to students, families, and stakeholders consistently through a variety of means. Methods utilized to keep parent involvement high and to keep them informed of their child's progress include:
- School Advisory Council (SAC) includes parent and community members and is open for any parent to attend. Notices of these meetings appear on school social media, school webpage, are posted on the school marquis, and are announced to students to inform their parents.
- Orientation is held the week before school during which parents and students attend an orientation assembly, meet their teachers, and explore the various clubs/organizations available at school.
-Beginning of the year grade level assemblies are conducted to provide inspiration, motivation, and build relationships.
- A family night for new/incoming students is held during the second semester, called Mission Transition/ Incoming 8th Grade Parent Night. This time allows for families to receive information on school courses, offerings, events, activities, and clubs.
- The school webpage includes a variety of school information including events, activities, Code of Conduct information, college and career preparation, standardized testing information, school history, and links to teacher email addresses.
- The school maintains an active Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter Account. Updates are done on a regular basis.
- Parents who have opted in to the School Messenger automated telephone system receive important announcements, reminders of upcoming events, and notification when their child is absent.
- Parent Internet Viewer allows parents to check their child's grades and attendance at any time.
- Athletic and other events are advertised to parents and are typically well attended by the entire community.

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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**