

Holmes District School Board

Poplar Springs 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	20

Poplar Springs High School

3726 ATOMIC DR, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://pshs.hdsb.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Laura Watford

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Holmes 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	20

Poplar Springs High School

3726 ATOMIC DR, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://pshs.hdsb.org/>

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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	8%

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 Holmes 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.

At Poplar Springs High School we believe that a strong education foundation for students is essential to ensure that all students reach their full potential. We will provide a variety of learning strategies that will empower all students to be innovative thinkers, creative problem solvers, effective communicators and productive citizens. We will ensure that our staff is well-qualified and continues to develop the skills and competencies necessary to guarantee a safe and secure learning environment. We will maintain accountability each day to ensure success tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Poplar Springs High School that students will be innovative thinkers, creative problem solvers, effective communicators and productive citizens. All students will develop a strong foundation for continual learning.

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
West, Farica	Principal	Develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Watford, Laura	Assistant Principal	Meeting with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems. Responding to disciplinary issues. Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards.
Goodson, Cynthia	Other	Oversees all aspects of K-12 student assessment to include implementation, collection, review and reporting of standardized test results. Develops and implements K -12 curriculum and assessment initiatives for the campus. Coordinates planning and implementation for all K-12 professional development activities.
Simmons, Alice	School Counselor	Works with students and parents to help them make the best academic and personal decisions. Meet with students to discuss any and all factors that could be impacting their education and offering assistance on topics such as college applications, conflict resolution and study techniques.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/1/2020, Laura Watford

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.*

27

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	29	20	18	23	21	43	19	24	34	35	31	21	27	345	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	7	6	2	13	3	11	5	6	18	5	7	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	6	8	5	2	3	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3	6	3	2	4	26	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	4	6	4	2	3	26	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	
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

Thursday 10/8/2020

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	22	29	35	25	38	26	30	44	43	34	22	30	30	408	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	4	2	2	1	0	3	1	3	2	2	0	25	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	3	4	11	11	8	0	7	15	67	

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	1	1	1	0	1	0	4

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	2	4	11	7	4	4	1	5	0	2	1	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	4

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	22	29	35	25	38	26	30	44	43	34	22	30	30	408	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	4	2	2	1	0	3	1	3	2	2	0	25	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	3	4	11	11	8	0	7	15	67	

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	1	1	1	0	1	0	4

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	2	4	11	7	4	4	1	5	0	2	1	0	0	41	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	53%	61%	49%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	53%	59%	49%	49%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	43%	54%	47%	38%	51%
Math Achievement	59%	53%	62%	46%	44%	58%
Math Learning Gains	63%	57%	59%	52%	46%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	52%	29%	34%	50%
Science Achievement	60%	52%	56%	48%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	72%	78%	68%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	68%	59%	9%	58%	10%
	2018	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-32%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	83%	52%	31%	56%	27%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		38%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
06	2019	45%	48%	-3%	54%	-9%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	58%	51%	7%	52%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	40%	3%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
	2018	82%	57%	25%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	80%	54%	26%	55%	25%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	57%	47%	10%	53%	4%
	2018	33%	46%	-13%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	47%	0%	62%	-15%
	2018	77%	58%	19%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	60%	26%	64%	22%
	2018	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	66%	50%	16%	60%	6%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%
	2018	42%	37%	5%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
07	2019	70%	61%	9%	54%	16%
	2018	53%	46%	7%	54%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				
08	2019	42%	35%	7%	46%	-4%
	2018	0%	30%	-30%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		42%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	48%	7%	53%	2%
	2018	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	39%	41%	-2%	48%	-9%
	2018	76%	58%	18%	50%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-37%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	63%	19%	67%	15%
2018	45%	42%	3%	65%	-20%
Compare		37%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	73%	3%	71%	5%
2018	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
Compare		-5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	57%	-21%	70%	-34%
2018	81%	64%	17%	68%	13%
Compare		-45%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	46%	2%	61%	-13%
2018	63%	40%	23%	62%	1%
Compare		-15%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	32%	-4%	57%	-29%
2018	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Compare		-16%			

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	44	38		28	38						
WHT	66	59	45	60	64	55	62	69	53	63	67
FRL	60	53	31	50	58	48	54	54		59	60
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	40	67		29	38		18				
WHT	60	55	61	58	56	47	52	87	80	86	44
FRL	52	53	55	46	51	46	35	67		69	
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	23	44	50	32	44	36					
WHT	49	49	44	46	52	28	49	69	83	78	43
FRL	33	46	54	32	36	31	31	42		73	36

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	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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	60
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	53
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.

Social Studies and Students with Disabilities

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

Middle grades acceleration showed the greatest decline. As the number of required courses increase to meet career planning and other mandates, students have less choice for accelerated course. With only 27 faculty at PSHS, one change to the master schedule can have a huge impact on the school as a whole.

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.

Geometry and History EOC's had the largest gap when compared to the state average. Both of these groups are high school courses that while students are required to take the tests, passing is not a requirement, therefore students do not take the content as seriously.

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

Third grade reading showed the greatest improvement. Our third grade has approx. 200 minutes of reading instruction per day to ensure students are meeting state standards and expectations.

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

Attendance is by far the greatest area of concern, with 25% of students with attendance currently below 90%. Due to health concerns, many students stay home if they have any symptoms of Covid-19. Students with 2 or more symptoms are required to self-isolate up to 14 days.

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

1. Improve student attendance
2. Improve innovative learning experiences for students when absences cannot be avoided
3. Improve learning gain rates of SWDs
4. Increase instructional relevance and support for all students in all grades through the MTSS process

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Currently, nearly 25% of PSHS students have attended fewer than 90% of instructional days. Student learning cannot occur when students are not present in class for instruction by highly qualified teachers. Research shows that attendance is one of the greatest factors toward student success.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with attendance below 90% will be decreased to no more than 15% of the student body. Of those with attendance issues, innovative learning will be strongly encouraged as a means of attendance on days students are absent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Watford (watfordl@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Parents will be contacted according to our district truancy policy. The administrative team in conjunction with classroom teachers will continually inform parents and students of the innovative learning option when students are out of school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective communication between school personnel and families has a great impact on school culture and climate and by effect student attendance and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to Covid-19, many parents are concerned about the health and safety of their and other children in the school setting. As a result, parents are opting to keep students home when they display even mild symptoms of illness. If students display two or more symptoms, they may be required to self-isolate in accordance with CDC and local public health unit guidelines. Currently our absenteeism rate is nearly 25% of students present less than 90% of instructional days. Many of these absences are unavoidable so we must focus on alternative ways to provide instruction such as innovative learning opportunities.

Measurable Outcome: 90% of courses at PSHS will have an innovative learning option for students that must be absent from the traditional classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will continue to receive in-service training on digital platforms to increase their proficiency in providing blended, simultaneous learning opportunities to students in their classroom and remotely.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Training and practice opportunities greatly improve teacher's instructional performance and confidence. With confidence, teachers are more likely to explore and effectively use digital platforms to increase student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improve learning gain rates for students with disabilities in reading and math.

Measurable Outcome: SWD's will increase learning gain rates in reading and math by 5% during the 20-21 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cynthia Goodson (cynthia.goodson@hdsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: SWD in middle and high grades are receiving all instruction via the inclusion and collaborative teaching model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that SWD learn at a higher rate in the general ed setting with appropriate supports versus the self-contained setting.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase instructional relevance and support for all students in all grades through the MTSS process.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall reading proficiency (as measured by iReady and FSA data) by 5% through use of the MTSS problem solving model.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	MTSS is an evidenced based problem solving model that helps teachers to align instruction based on data and provide remediation to students in specific domains of deficiency, throughout all three tiers of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The effectiveness of the MTSS process is the reason our district and state have approved this model.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additional priorities will be addressed through bi-weekly teacher conferencing and PLCs.

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.

PSHS encourages parental and community involvement throughout the school year through school activities such as Family Thanksgiving Feast, Veteran's Day, Awards Day, and many other family events. The community is also involved in the many sporting events held throughout the year as well. Local businesses and organizations support the many activities at PSHS through volunteer hours and donations. PSHS has been successful in creating a positive school culture and environment by inviting stakeholders to

participate in the School Advisory Council, continuously publishing school news via local news outlets, social media, and the school website page. Poplar Springs is truly a community school.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00