Alonso High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Alonso High School

8302 MONTAGUE ST, Tampa, FL 33635

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: James Harris P   Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Hillsborough 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

Alonso High School

8302 MONTAGUE ST, Tampa, FL 33635

[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	No	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

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 Hillsborough 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.

Braulio Alonso High School is a community where excellence is the goal, diversity is valued, integrity is expected and school pride is the result.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alonso faculty, staff, parents and community strive to provide a Raven's N.E.S.T; a Nurturing Environment for Successful Teaching.

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
Hart, Kenneth	Principal	
Harris, James	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Hoover, Brian	Assistant Principal	IB Curriculum
Hefley, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Student Affairs

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/3/2020, James Harris P

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
139

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	652	616	633	600	2501
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	67	56	76	258
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	90	89	71	313
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	74	24	3	139
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	15	27	6	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	0	120
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	16	0	0	123

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	86	75	95	52	308

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	5	5
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

Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	652	634	658	600	2544
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	43	44	42	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	6	6	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	71	62	56	237
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	40	34	31	144

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	44	53	47	45	189

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	1	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	652	634	658	600	2544
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	43	44	42	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	6	6	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	71	62	56	237
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	40	34	31	144

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	44	53	47	45	189

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	1	1	
Students retained two or more times	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	57%	56%	56%	53%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	54%	51%	53%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	41%	42%	40%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	49%	51%	58%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	48%	48%	58%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	45%	45%	46%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	86%	69%	68%	69%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	75%	73%	77%	74%	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	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
2018	62%	62%	0%	65%	-3%
Compare		19%			

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	73%	73%	0%	70%	3%
2018	72%	70%	2%	68%	4%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	63%	2%	61%	4%
2018	27%	63%	-36%	62%	-35%
Compare		38%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	57%	-7%	57%	-7%
2018	50%	56%	-6%	56%	-6%
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	17	35	34	36	48	28	62	41		96	13
ELL	19	49	45	38	50	49	48	40		90	40
ASN	71	66		71	79		100	92		100	59
BLK	51	51	38	38	46	19	86	65		97	21
HSP	48	55	41	48	52	44	80	69		94	40
MUL	59	56		62	41			71		92	43
WHT	72	63	57	69	55	41	92	88		98	53
FRL	48	55	43	47	53	39	77	66		95	37
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	36	31	16	27	31	30	34		80	23
ELL	19	47	50	27	33	28	34	39		90	47
ASN	83	72		79	65		89	77		100	56
BLK	47	47	34	34	39		55	69		93	31
HSP	43	45	42	35	39	29	57	66		92	41
MUL	58	53		52	43		64	81		100	57
WHT	73	53	55	62	50	50	79	88		98	54
FRL	44	46	41	35	39	31	58	67		93	40

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	11	30	28	29	45	37	23	50		82	21
ELL	16	36	33	40	55	51	41	38		81	33
ASN	65	58		74	65		91	83		92	71
BLK	44	51	40	45	48	35	57	92		89	29
HSP	42	47	37	50	57	46	61	70		88	40
MUL	62	57		80	64		89	83		95	45
WHT	73	63	54	71	60	49	80	87		96	51
FRL	41	47	37	50	56	47	59	67		87	37

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

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	48
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	
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	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	51
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	57
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	61
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	69
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.

Alonso analyzed other types of data to determine our academic areas of strength and needs. Data such as quarterly, semester, and yearly students' academic reports from teachers, subject area informative and summative assessments and trends from previous years.

The total number of Ds/Fs grades earned in our Algebra 1 curriculum in the 1st/2nd Semester in the 2019-2020 school year increased to 222 compared to 192 in the 2018-2019 school year. This is an increase of 14%. We believe that the contributing factors to the decline in the number of students earning a passing grade in Algebra I were the fact that students, in the 4th quarter, did not have access to face-to-face classroom instruction and they didn't have access to the extended day tutorial programs.

This is not a trend since the number of students making learning gains in math improved from 44% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. The number of students in the math lowest 25 percentile who passed the Algebra I EOC improved from 35% in 2018 to 40% in 2019.

The number of students who passed Physical Science with a grade of "D" or better decreased by 5% from 95% in the 2018-2019 school-year to 90% in the 2019-2020 school year. This 5% dropped was complicated by the addition of advanced math concepts incorporated in the 2019-2020 Physical Science curriculum which some had not mastered throughout the year. eLearning during the fourth grading period limited the options teachers had to provide additional assistance to these students.

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

We continue to be concerned with the number of students in the Math lowest 25th percentile. A significant number of these students were enrolled in Algebra1A/1B in the 2019-2020 school year. The number of students who earned grades of Ds/Fs in Algebra 1A/1B in the 2019-2020 school year increased by 14% compared to the 2018-2019 school year. In addition, in the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years, only 35% and 40% made learning gains respectively compared to the district average of 44% and 45%. This decline in academic and assessment performance of students in the math lowest 25th percentile is concerning to us because it demonstrates a trend.

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.

Please note that since there were no state assessments administered in the 2019-2020 school year, we analyzed other types of data to determine our academic areas of strength and needs improvement. Data such as, but not limited to, quarterly, semester, and yearly students' academic reports from teachers, subject area informative and summative assessment, and trends from previous years.

The lower number of Students With Disabilities, (SWD) who achieved passing scores and made learning gains on all state assessments, compared to that of all other subgroups, continues to be a trend and concern for us. In the 2018 and 2019 school year, only 17% and 20% respectively of SWD achieved a passing grade on the ELA compared to 72% and 73% of Whites. This is a percentage gap of 55% in 2018 and 53% in 2019.

In addition, SWD also performed lower than most subgroups such as Hispanics (HSP) and students who received Free or Reduce Lunch (FRL). For example, the number of HSP students who earned a passing score on the ELA in 2018 and 2019 was 48% and 43% respectively, compared to 17% of SWD. This is a percentage gap of 31% and 26% respectively. The number of FRL students who earned a passing score on the ELA in 2018 and 2019 was 48% and 44% respectively, compared to 17% of SWD. This is a percentage gap of 31% in 2018 and 27% in 2019.

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

Overall, the total number of grades of Ds/Fs of 9th and 10th ELA courses decreased. These courses were English 9, English Honors 9, English 10, English ESOL 9, English10, English Honors 10, English ESOL 10, Reading and Intensive Reading classes. This represents a 4% decrease of Ds/Fs in the 2018-2019 school year from 596 to 575 in the 2019-2020school year. These are classes where students learned the Florida State Standards, which are measured on the ELA State Assessments.

What contributed to this decrease was the ELA teams' effort in analyzing student data to predict potential problems students may encounter in mastering specific literacy skills and then planning lessons targeting these areas instead of following the pacing guide. The ELA department also collaborated, during their professional learning communities, on best instructional strategies to use specially with struggling students.
In addition, the total number of students in all grades who earned a grade of "D" or "F" in all our courses decreased by 17%. The number of students with Ds/Fs in the 2018-2019 school year went from 3326 to 2775 in the 2019-2020 school year.

One major contributing factor was the increased use of technology by all teachers to support instruction during eLearning in the 4th grading period due to school closures. Most teachers made use of platforms such as Office 365, Sway, Forms, One note, and Microsoft teams to communicate with students, and display instruction that was user friendly.

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

The number of students who had two or more EWS increased significantly. This is a result of our efforts to diminish school wide discipline problems. Many times, administrators assign students, who normally would be assigned Out of School Suspension (OSS) to In School Suspension (ISS), to give those students the opportunity to still be in school and do their academic assignments for credit. This is less like to happen if they are assigned OSS.

In addition, attendance is still a concern. The number of students who attend school less than 90% of the school days in the year also increased. All Student Affairs departments will continue to make improving student attendance a priority.

We will develop a collaborative plan with out Positive Behavior Support, (PBS) program to improve school wide attendance and diminish behavioral problems.

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

1. Increase the number of students making gains in the ELA lowest 25 percentile from 43% in the 2018-2019 school year to 49% in the 2020-2021 school year. This is an increase of 6%. We choose an increase of 6% to reflect the percentage growth over a two year period (2019-2020 and 2020-2021), since no state assessments were held in the 2019-2020 due to school closures, in an effort to minimize the spread of COVID-19.

2. Increase the number of students making gains in the Math lowest 25 percentile from 40% in the 2018-2019 school year to 47% in the 2020-2021 school year. This is an increase of 7%. We choose an increase of 7% to reflect the percentage growth over a two year period (2019-2020 and 2020-2021), since no state assessments were held in the 2019-2020 due to school closures in an effort to minimize the spread of COVID-19.

3. Increase the number of Student With Disability making learning gains from 35% in the 2018-2019 school year to 45% in the 2020-2021 school year. This is an increase of 10%. We choose an increase of 10% to reflect the percentage growth over a two year period (2019-2020 and 2020-2021), since no state assessments were held in the 2019-2020 due to school closures in an effort to minimize the spread of COVID-19.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 43% of the number of students in ELA lowest 25th percentile made learning gains in the 2018-2019 school year compared to 57% for all students in the school. In addition, only 43% of students in ELA lowest 25% percentile made learning gains in the 2017-2018 school year compared to 49% for all students in the school. This data demonstrates a trend
Measurable Outcome:	Alonso High School will increase the number of students making gains, in the ELA lowest 25th percentile, from 43% in the 2018-2019 school year, to 48% in the 2020-2021 school year to reflect two years growth. This is an increase of 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kenneth Hart (kenneth.hart@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Academic Moves will be used as a tier two MTSS in order to improve student vocabulary and common language Achieve 3000 for students will be used to receive online literacy instruction and practice. With this program students can monitor their own growth and teachers of all content areas can track students' reading progress to identify best-differentiated strategies to implement in the classroom. A Teacher Talent Developer (TTD) works collaboratively with teachers to design lesson plans to improve instructional strategies to address the diverse skill levels of BQ students, who consist of many students in the ESE, ELL, and FRL subgroups. Teachers determine PLC's in reading based on the data monitoring and student progress throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are utilizing the above reading programs based on a district wide initiative to have a consistent reading curriculum across all schools and across all grade level. Lower grade level students will start with the newest curriculum and continue to built their skills and familiarity with the program as they move up throughout the grades. Academic Moves are reading programs that demonstrate the best alignment with the Florida State Standards and that our students show the most gains when expose to these programs online practice and classroom instruction. A TDD who specializes in coaching teachers on the usage of best instructional practices in the classroom will assist teachers of BQ students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. At the start of the school year, Level 1 and 2 BQ students will be reassessed. Formative data from the pre-assessments used by the Achieve 3000 online curriculum, district quarterly CommonLit assessment, and Read Theory pretest will be used. This information will allow us to immediately identify students' present levels in literacy and grade level ELA remediation needed to support possible regression during asynchronous learning.

2. ELA, PLC, and ILT instructional teams will review school wide data periodically and then guide individual ELA teachers through data chats. Emphasis will be on the results of common assessment used in all ELA classrooms.

3. Tier 2 vocabulary initiative "Academic Moves" will continue to be used school wide

4. Teachers will continue to use formative assessment data throughout the year to determine skill-building assignments for students when they attend extended day tutorials.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our BQ students in math continue to make gains. IXL Achievement online platform data, for the 4th quarter grading period, shows that 42.7% of our 109 BQ students made learning gains compared to the district average of 40.18%. Although the IXL Achievement and Algebra EOC are not the same assessments, they both measure the same state standards. Therefore comparing the result on these two assessments is relevant. 42.7% is still below the 2018-2019 district and state percentages of 45% district and 45% state math BQ learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students making gains in the math lowest 25th percentile from 40% in 2018-2019 school year to 46% in the 2020-2021 school year. This is an increase of 6%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kenneth Hart (kenneth.hart@hcps.net)
	Reading levels of students in the math lowest 25th percentile are identified during the pre-school period and, if needed, are scheduled in a reading class.
	Students in the math lowest 25th percentile are scheduled doubled block and assigned the same teacher through their years of learning the Algebra I curriculum.
	A Teacher Talent Developer (TTD) works collaboratively with teachers to design lesson plans to improve instructional strategies to address the diverse skill levels of BQ students, who consist of many students in the ESE, ELL, and FRL subgroups.
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in the math lowest 25th percentile are scheduled doubled block and assigned the same teacher through their years of learning the Algebra I curriculum.
	Teachers determine PLC's in math based on the data monitoring and student progress throughout the school year.
	The use of friendly online platforms was found to be an effective tool during eLearning. Teachers will continue to use these student platforms to reinforce the concepts learned in the classroom.
	A significant number of students in the math lowest 25th percentile are ELL students. Teachers of math BQ students will work collaboratively with our ESOL department to address language barriers effecting this population.
	During the two years most BQ students are enrolled in Algebra 1A or 1B, they are also enrolled in reading classes to improve their comprehension and vocabulary skills, which can better help them comprehend the word problems on the Algebra One ECO.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A TDD who specializes in coaching teachers on the usage of best instructional practices in the classroom will assist teachers of BQ students.
	The continuity of having the same teacher for two periods for two years is vital for the teacher to student relationship by providing students with a level of comfort ideal for learning.
	The ESOL department can best assist teachers incorporate instructional strategies of language acquisition into their lesson plans.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students in algebra 1A and 1B will be double blocked and assigned the same teacher for both periods throughout the years they are learning the Algebra one curriculum.

2. At the start of the school year, teachers will identify the math skills students are deficient in, through formative pre-test, since students have not received face-to-face instruction in about five months, then design their lesson plans and pace based on this data.

3. All students in Algebra 1A and 1B accounts will also be on the friendly online platform IXL Achievement.

4. Students will be strongly encouraged to attend tutoring before school or after school or during lunch

5. ESOL para professionals will provide more instructional support to ELL BQ students in Algebra 1A and 1B classes.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD students performed the lowest in the ELA learning gains compared to all other subgroups for the 2018-2019 school year. SWD ELA learning gain percentage was 35% compared to ELL 49%, BLK 51%, HSP 55%, MUL 56%, WHT 63%, and FRL 55%
Measurable Outcome:	Alonso High School will increase the number of students in the SWD making learning gains in ELA from 34% in the 2018-2019 school year to 38% in the 2020-2021 school year. This is an increase of 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	All content area ESE and Gen Ed teachers use a variety of differentiated instructional strategies in the classroom appropriate to ESE students' best learning methods. ESE, Gen Ed teachers, ESE specialist, department head, and district ESE support personnel, (inclusion practice, RR, and Access points programs) will collaborate and attend PLC during morning common planning periods. Biography Driven Instruction (BDI)-ESE teachers will select reading passages and writing assignments that are relevant and sensitive to the lives and cultures of ESE students. ESE teachers will establish communication with parents to build a collaborative partnership to assist ESE students. Encourage ESE students of all level to participate in school wide events, which will improve the school culture and spirit. Mainstream the procedures, which reflects a friendly and welcoming experience, of registering new ESE students to Alonso High School ESE teachers will collaborate with Gen Ed teachers during before school planning time to review data of students in their classroom so target instruction is implement. The ESE specialist along with the ESE department head and district specialist will provide PLC on ESE school wide data, students' LRE, and common trends of deficient literacy skills ESE students demonstrate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers implement BDI in their classroom, ESE students are more engaged in classroom activities because they can relate to the assignment they need to complete to show their understanding of the content. Including all students in ESE programs into school wide events establishes strong school morale and culture. Parent involvement is a key component to ensure what students learn in school is supported at home. Effective Online platforms used during eLeanring will be used to supplement learning of the content.

Mainstreaming the ESE registration process reduces the possibility that students are placed in incorrect ESE classes and establish communication with parents.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all ESE students are scheduled correctly based on the needs written on their IEP's

2. ESE case managers communicate with Gen Ed teachers, inform them of who their ESE students are, establish, and maintain communication throughout the school year about their progress.

3. All ESE and content area teachers will include the use of online platforms to reinforce the skills and concepts learned in the classroom so students can practice the skills and review the concepts on the platforms at home

4. ESE teachers will include the use of technology in their lessons to enhance student learning.

5. ESE teachers will help students self-reflect on their learning and behaviors during support facilitation sessions.

6. ESE teachers will contact the parents of ESE students on their caseload to introduce themselves within the first 30 school days of the start of school year.

7. A consistent procedure for registering new ESE students and two or more people of contact at the front office will be established.

8. Continue to include ESE students in school wide events

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To achieve our goal of increasing the number of students who receive a passing grade in Physical Science from 90% in 2019-2020 to 95% in 2020-2021, Physical Science teachers will work collaboratively with algebra one teachers to identify the math standards students need to master in order to be able to solve the word problems and lab work in their Physical Science classes.

To improve our attendance rate, all teachers will be required to contact parents/guardians if the student has been absent for three or more consecutive days. The teachers will be required to contact the student's APSA when they have been absent for five or more consecutive days. The APSA will immediately investigate the student's absences, and if no parent contact is made, a home visit will be scheduled. In addition, school administrators, guidance counselors, social work, and the school psychologist will conduct non-academic assessment needs for students, so that the student's emotional and physical needs are met and they can place their focus on his/her academics.

To reduce the number of school suspensions teachers will make contact with parents/gaurdians if behavior issues arise. If the behavior continues teachers will send a referral to SAO. At that time an APSA will investigate and followup. School administrators will meet monthly to discuss alternatives to traditional consequences, such as In School Suspension (ISS) or Out of School Suspensions (OSS), when processing discipline refers. Some of the non-traditional consequences students could be assigned are, Saturday Success, referred to guidance counselor for counseling, AM or PM work detail, teacher helper during the student's non-academic time, after school/weekend clean ups of non-profit agencies in the community such as parks at public housing communities, and/or assigned to conflict resolution classes held in school or community, etc.

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.

Alonso High School continuously strives to build a positive school culture and environment by ensuring all stakeholders are involved. Some of the systems in place to make this happen are monthly Raven Round Table meetings with our School Advisory Committee. In addition, our Principal communicates with all stakeholders weekly about school events, polices, school trends, and any other information that is important for stakeholders to know through phone announcements, parent links, and many social media platforms.

When important school wide decisions need to be made, school administration seeks the input of all stakeholders through online surveys and parent links.

Alonso High School also has community partnerships with local profit businesses and non-profit organizations such as World of Westchase (WOW), local churches, restaurants, insurance companies, and merchants.

Throughout the year, Alonso High School invites the community to its school wide events such as Open House, Parent Conference Nights, Athletic events, Booster club meeting, fund raisers, performance held by our Fine Arts department, and Veteran's Day Ceremonial event.

Finally, Alonso also encourages school wide positive school culture and environment through its Positive Behavior Support program. In addition, students are always encouraged to join athletic and/or social clubs or take part in extracurricular activities of their liking.

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
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**