

Calhoun County School District

Altha Public 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Altha Public School

25820 NE FUQUA CIR, Altha, FL 32421

www.althaschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Patrick Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 10/14/2020

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)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Calhoun 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Altha Public School

25820 NE FUQUA CIR, Altha, FL 32421

www.althaschool.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	81%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	9%

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 Calhoun 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.

Altha Public School strives to provide every student the opportunity to excel academically, emotionally, and socially in a safe, positive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Altha Public School believes each student should be recognized as a unique individual who should be allowed to perform at their full potential academically, emotionally, and socially—regardless of race, gender, ethnic or social background, religious beliefs, or ability.

Altha Public School believes that a caring relationship between teachers and students is vital to ensure the success of every child.

Altha Public School recognizes that a Pre-Kindergarten through twelfth grade school has greatly varied age differences and needs, which provide unique opportunities and challenges. Therefore, Altha Public School believes it is crucial for teachers, parents, and community members, collaboratively, to provide students with experiences that will enable them to become productive citizens.

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
Price, Sue	Principal	<p>The principal, Sue Price serves as instructional leader as she communicates the school's vision and mission to all stakeholders and functions as the school's primary spokesperson. She establishes high, clearly defined, measurable instructional expectations and models open communication. Mrs. Price creates a highly cooperative atmosphere where the sharing of ideas is encouraged and she is the school's liaison to the District Leadership Team. She oversees the school's budget, makes final decisions regarding facility usage, teacher assignments, and master scheduling. Mrs. Price also provides coverage and security at school sponsored events, conducts staff and teacher evaluations, and serves as the school's contact for professional development. Assistants Treva McCroan and Patrick Jones also serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making as it relates to various aspects such as discipline, student attendance, conducting teacher observations, overseeing textbook adoptions and the approval/purchasing of instructional materials, facilitating the writing of the School Improvement Plan, and overseeing parent involvement activities.</p> <p>Guidance counselors Zoe Tatum and Charlene Yon oversee student enrollment and ESE services at the school level. They also establish all standardized testing schedules and coordinate online requirements. Curriculum Coach, Cindy Alday serves as an instructional leader and shares in decision making as she mentors beginning teachers and monitors the implementation of curriculum across all grade levels. She also facilitates the MTSS/RTi process with teachers and parents and maintains all required documentation.</p> <p>Kaye Lewis serves as a teacher leader and represents the interest of all teachers on the leadership team. She is a model teacher and exhibits best practices daily.</p>
McCroan, Treva	Assistant Principal	
Tatum, Zoe	School Counselor	
Yon, Charlene	School Counselor	
Alday, Cindy	Instructional Coach	
Jones, Patrick	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 10/14/2020, Patrick Jones

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.*

1

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

45

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)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	44	41	48	40	36	46	49	54	53	39	53	31	40	574	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	6	10	7	10	42	43	47	28	35	21	15	281	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	0	4	2	0	14	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	5	8	9	6	4	6	49	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	14	8	4	1	3	47	

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	4	9	10	17	8	9	3	4	64	

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	4	0	18	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/14/2020

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	54	53	44	43	49	50	54	55	51	66	41	52	47	659
Attendance below 90 percent	9	3	9	12	6	6	13	11	11	10	7	14	12	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4	2	0	4	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	4	2	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	12	15	11	5	8	13	7	85

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	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	1	6	7	2	33

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	12	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	54	53	44	43	49	50	54	55	51	66	41	52	47	659	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	3	9	12	6	6	13	11	11	10	7	14	12	123	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4	2	0	4	0	22	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	4	2	17	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	12	15	11	5	8	13	7	85	

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	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	1	6	7	2	33

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	12	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	62%	61%	58%	61%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	61%	59%	47%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	54%	42%	39%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	60%	64%	62%	53%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%	61%	59%	46%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	52%	41%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	64%	57%	56%	56%	55%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	75%	78%	69%	69%	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	76%	62%	14%	58%	18%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%
	2018	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	62%	57%	5%	56%	6%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	56%	60%	-4%	54%	2%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
07	2019	61%	53%	8%	52%	9%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	64%	70%	-6%	56%	8%
	2018	63%	70%	-7%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019	54%	64%	-10%	55%	-1%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	53%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
10	2019	70%	66%	4%	53%	17%
	2018	64%	59%	5%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	67%	0%	62%	5%
	2018	82%	77%	5%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	70%	5%	64%	11%
	2018	79%	65%	14%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	62%	56%	6%	60%	2%
	2018	32%	53%	-21%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
06	2019	38%	64%	-26%	55%	-17%
	2018	47%	63%	-16%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	69%	68%	1%	54%	15%
	2018	65%	71%	-6%	54%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	45%	54%	-9%	46%	-1%
	2018	61%	68%	-7%	45%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	54%	56%	-2%	48%	6%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	50%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		2%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	76%	-12%	67%	-3%
2018	73%	69%	4%	65%	8%
Compare		-9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	74%	-1%	71%	2%
2018	69%	77%	-8%	71%	-2%
Compare		4%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	78%	3%	70%	11%
2018	73%	73%	0%	68%	5%
Compare		8%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	66%	-3%	61%	2%
2018	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Compare		15%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	57%	-12%	57%	-12%
2018	59%	62%	-3%	56%	3%
Compare		-14%			

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	30	42	35	28	33	16	44	59			
HSP	59	63		61	67			70			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	63	61	44	60	51	39	65	78	61	85	53
FRL	55	56	47	58	49	38	55	74	50	79	42
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	20	34	38	32	46	45	31	50			
HSP	63	57		48	36		80				
MUL	62	55		86	82						
WHT	57	52	43	60	52	47	56	72	75	81	59
FRL	53	51	49	57	54	54	50	68	80	71	60
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	27	31	39	22	37	33	17	38		90	
HSP	59	59		59	64		50				
MUL	75	30		55							
WHT	57	47	41	52	44	39	55	67	59	88	60
FRL	51	42	38	46	41	37	55	68	50	86	56

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	61
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	667
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
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	64
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	
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	55
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 lowest data component is the Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%, which is 41%. English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% was next to lowest at 47%. One contributing factor is the loss of at least a month's worth of instruction due to Hurricane Michael. Teacher turn over and lack of certified teachers in middle and high school mathematics is another contributing factor.

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

The Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25% of students is the data component that showed the greatest decline. As a school, we dropped 8 percentage points in 2018. Hurricane Michael was a contributing factor resulting in the loss of at least a month's worth of instruction. Teacher turn over and lack of certified teachers in middle and high school mathematics is another contributing factor.

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 Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% of students has the greatest gap when compared to the state average which is eleven percentage points below the state average. Again, the contributing factors are a loss of a month's worth of instruction due to Hurricane Michael, the lack of certified math teachers, and teacher turnover.

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

The English Language Arts Learning Gains increased nine percentage points in the last school year. As a school more focus was placed on progress monitoring with iReady and providing interventions.

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

A potential area of concern is attendance being below 90%. If students are not here to receive instruction they will not experience growth. Many of our most struggling students are often absent or tardy. We need to continue to work with families to ensure children are here and on time as well as adjust and monitor our attendance plan.

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

1. Students with disabilities -the students with disabilities subgroup is 36% which is below the 41% threshold set by ESSA.
2. Math Lowest 25%
3. ELA Lowest 25%
4. Third Grade ELA Scores

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The students with disabilities subgroup is below the federal index of 41% (36%). The students that make up the subgroup of students with disabilities are also students that are included in the school's lowest 25% subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	Altha Public School's students with disabilities subgroup federal index achievement measure will increase from 36%(2019) to 38% in 2020-2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sue Price (sue.price@calhounflschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement small group instruction using the SPIRE program to close instructional gaps among our students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The SPIRE program is an evidenced based, research-proven reading intervention program for our lowest performing students. The program provides multi-sensory, systematic, differentiated/leveled instruction that is data driven, using sequentially structured lessons to ensure mastery of concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Inclusion teachers providing small group instruction.
2. The addition of a Title 1 resource teacher
3. Change/updates in math curriculum:
 - a. Increase the rigor in 4th & 5th grade math curriculum
 - b. Pre-K change to the NY Engage math curriculum
 - c. Concentration of number sense in K-1
4. Increase the use of Math fluency in elementary levels
5. Progress monitor in high school math for college readiness
6. Targeted Intensive Reading Instruction using Rewards and FOCUS on Reading for Tier 3 students in ELA in middle and high school.
7. Morning computer lab for targeted instruction and extra practice .

Person Responsible Sue Price (sue.price@calhounflschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

As our school prepares for both online and brick and mortar learning, we will focus more than ever on strengthening relations with students and families.

We will do that by the following:

Collaboration - Families and community organization are vital to student success. Authentic teamwork by both parties is critical. Teachers will share data and resources to support student learning in and out of the classroom via ParentSquare, notes homes, phone calls, emails, school website, and Google Classroom.

Cooperation - Schools and families working together to provide the best education possible for students.

Communication - Sharing information and being transparent is critical. We plan to create a meaningful system for all voices to be heard and incorporate their feedback into the decision-making process by providing them with regular opportunities to share feedback and concerns via surveys, virtual parent conferences, and ParentSquare .

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.

Altha Public School understands and appreciates the power of parental involvement and its relationship in building a successful academic program. Although the restrictions of the 2020-2021 school year will hinder the level of participation that is normal at Altha School the administration and faculty will provide alternative ways to communicate with parents and keep them involved in their child's educational endeavors. At all times, parents have access to the parent portal FOCUS, which allows parents to monitor student attendance and grades. Progress reports are issued at the midpoint of each grading period for those performing below acceptable levels in an effort to maintain communication with parents. Parent/teacher conferences are encouraged and advocated by parents, teachers, counselors, and administrators when a need for intervention occurs. ParentSquare is also a communication tool utilized by administrators and teachers to communicate with parents. Parents can also respond via ParentSquare. Additionally, the district Family Liaison completes home visits when applicable and necessary. At the beginning of each school year, all families are invited to an open house where they meet their student's teachers, guidance counselors, and administration. If possible throughout the families will have the opportunity to participate in Reading and Math Nights, grade level parent meetings, and days recognizing moms and dads, etc. The school maintains a website that features a current calendar which informs parents and students of opportunities and events in which they can participate. Communication of our school's vision and mission is also facilitated via phone calls home, newsletters, and the marquee in front of the school. Social media outlets such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter are also utilized. Our partnership with the Parent Teacher

organization (PTO) and School Advisory Council (SAC) offers opportunities for parents to become involved in the school's initiatives and goals. They are forums in which parents can make suggestions and ask questions related to all areas of the 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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00