

The School District of Desoto

Desoto Secondary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Desoto Secondary School

318 N WILSON AVE, Arcadia, FL 34266

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amy Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Desoto 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Desoto Secondary School

318 N WILSON AVE, Arcadia, FL 34266

[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)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the School District of Desoto is to prepare all students to be successful citizens and productive workers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide the tools and resources necessary to promote growth necessary to graduate and enter adulthood college and/or career ready.

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
McGill, Sally	Assistant Principal	Oversee employees and students at DeSoto Secondary School; Monitor student progression; complete grad plans and make scheduling decisions; serve as only on-site administrator responsible for day to day routines.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2020, Amy Bennett

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

3

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	28	11	6	4	12	69
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	1	0	5	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	1	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	7	5	2	7	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	6	6	7	0	12	54

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	7	24	8	6	3	11	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0%	0%	61%	0%	0%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	0%	59%	0%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	0%	62%	0%	0%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	0%	59%	0%	0%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	0%	56%	0%	0%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	0%	78%	0%	0%	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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	10%	32%	-22%	54%	-44%
	2018	0%	33%	-33%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	0%	29%	-29%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	34%	-34%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	37%	-37%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	37%	-37%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	17%	-17%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	10%	17%	-7%	53%	-43%
	2018	0%	34%	-34%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	9%	36%	-27%	55%	-46%
	2018	0%	35%	-35%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	18%	33%	-15%	54%	-36%
	2018	0%	36%	-36%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	0%	8%	-8%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	17%	-17%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	29%	-29%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	28%	-28%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	67%	-67%
2018	10%	44%	-34%	65%	-55%
Compare		-10%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	9%	43%	-34%	71%	-62%
2018	0%	46%	-46%	71%	-71%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	58%	-27%	70%	-39%
2018	29%	49%	-20%	68%	-39%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	40%	-40%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	44%	-44%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	39%	-39%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	35%	-35%	56%	-56%
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
HSP										6	
WHT										15	
FRL										7	
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
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											
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
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											

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	6
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	17
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	6
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

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	15
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	7
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Data in all subject areas across all grade levels demonstrate low performance for all subgroups. One contributing factor is the student population of DeSoto Secondary School, DSS is the District's alternative school. The student body is primarily comprised of students that meet at least one of the following criteria:

- (1) student is considerably behind their cohort with regard to credits accrued
- (2) student is excessively truant and enrolled at DSS in attempt to prevent the student from dropping out
- (3) student has pending criminal charge(s)
- (4) student has accrued a significant number of office referrals at the middle or high school

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

There is not sufficient longitudinal data to draw any meaningful, relevant conclusions based on comparison data. The testing areas showing data for SY 17-18 and SY 18-19 do not show any decline from one year to the next. This is likely due to the number of students testing from one year to the next. This is primarily due to the relatively small number of test subjects for each grade level and/or test subject area. This is expected to change as student enrollment continues to increase. SY

19-20 enrollment was considerably higher, but due to Covid-19, regular scheduled EOCs and FSA assessments were not administered.

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.

Gaps for all subject areas, regardless of grade level, are considerably below both district and statewide averages. EOC's aside, the gaps between school and state averages for 6th grade ELA and math (-44% and -46%); 7th grade math (-36%) and 10th grade ELA (-43%) are remarkable. One contributing factor is the student population being served at DSS. Many of our students are alternatively placed as an alternative to expulsion or due to excessive behavior problems at the District's traditional middle and high school. Students with pending felony charges or those that have been formally charged are also transferred to DeSoto Secondary School. Furthermore, enrollment is fluid throughout the school year with students being alternatively placed and other transferring back to their "home schools" throughout the school year.

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

The only "new" data available is an increase in graduation rate. The graduation rate for the previous reporting period was <10%. SY graduation data for SY 2018-2019 improved to 26%.

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

- (1) The primary area of concern is ELA across all grade levels, in all subgroups. Without fundamental reading comprehension skills at the middle school level, student success on high school EOCs and other assessments is unlikely.
- (2) Development of math skills necessary to demonstrate proficiency on grade level math assessments.

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

1. Increase emphasis on reading by direct instruction to include fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension with an emphasis on utilizing content area reading
2. Increased proficiency in math applications and reasoning in mathematics
3. Increase in graduation rate
4. Improve attendance rate
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Students must be able to read to demonstrate success in most every area of their lives, both school-related and not. Students in grades 6 scored -22% lower compared to those at the District's only traditional middle school and -44% lower than the state average. Further, 10th grade students scored -7% below the district average and -43% below the state average. This gap continues as one reviews the discrepancy between proficiency levels at the school, district, and state levels on EOCs for Civics, Biology, and US History, assessments that rely heavily on a student's ability to read and comprehend the assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

In testing groups of 10 or more, DSS will decrease the gap between school and statewide data by 10% as compared to this year's difference. For example, the difference between DSS 6th grade ELA scores and the state average during SY 18-19 was -44%, our initial school year goal is to decrease the gap by 10%, or 4.4% ($44.0 - 4.4 = 39.6\% >> 40\%$).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

(1) District recommended reading program "Wit and Wisdom" will be used in the middle school classrooms. All middle school students will have intensive reading classes that are direct-taught rather than computer-cased. More one-on-one help is currently available to students that are struggling due to an increase in staff since SY 2018-2019. (subgroup: Caucasian)

(2) Increased use of cooperative learning groups when feasible. The teacher as a facilitator of a cooperative learning group encourages communication among peer groups. Gestures and private praise should be used as a way of communicating. (subgroup: Hispanic)

(3) Teacher-directed instruction in, and practice with, affixes, bases and roots. When teaching these in context and allowing students to analyze words by breaking them apart, we can help students build word analysis and attack skills to help them determine the meaning of unknown words. This will help build additional vocabulary, which will in turn help to develop deeper comprehension of text and speech. (subgroup: economically disadvantaged)

(1) Data collected from schools using the "Wit and Wisdom" reading program demonstrated an improvement in Reading and ELA test scores as is evidenced by both the district progress monitoring tool as well as the state-mandated ELA assessments for grades 3-8. Research also supports individualized instruction as a primary causal strategy influencing student reading comprehension gains. (subgroup: Caucasian)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

(2) Use of cooperative learning groups that are more peer led/teacher facilitated will allow for the teacher to observe and implement communication techniques that lend to greater participation and growth among Hispanic students. Allowing the Hispanic student to participate in learning activities in a group setting releases some of the fear of being singled out among peers while also allowing for the teacher to offer praise and feedback in a way that does not cause unnecessary discomfort. The purpose of cooperative learning groups is to make each member a stronger individual in his or her right. Students learn together through face-to-face interaction so that they can subsequently perform higher as individuals.

(3) Studies show that children entering public schools from poorer households have heard

5 million fewer words in their short lifetimes than their more economically secure counterparts. In addition, economically disadvantaged students are less likely to have traveled or have been exposed to the fine arts. Essentially, poorer children have much less background knowledge than those from financially secure homes. Direct instruction of roots, bases, and affixes will help bridge the gap in background knowledge by allowing EDS more opportunity to make connections between known and unknown terms to have improve success determining the meanings of unknown words in context. (subgroup: economically disadvantaged)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of "Wit and Wisdom" reading program has been proven to help drive student achievement.
2. Addition of middle school reading to all student schedules.
- 3 Direct taught reading instruction, as opposed to computer-based delivery, to include vocabulary instruction.
4. Increased one-on-one attention for struggling readers; small cooperative groups.
5. Lesson planning to be based on data progress monitoring results to address areas of deficit on an individual basis.

Person Responsible Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students must be proficient in math to achieve success in school and in real-life situations. Students in grade 6 scored -27% lower compared to those at the middle school and -46% lower than the state average. Further, 0% of students demonstrated mastery in Algebra or Geometry.

Measurable Outcome: In testing groups of 10 or more, DSS will decrease the gap between school and statewide data by 10% as compared to this year's difference. For example, the difference between DSS 6th grade math scores and the state average during SY 18-19 was -46%, our initial school year goal is to decrease that gap by 10%, or 4.6% ($46.0 - 4.6 = 41.4\% >> 42\%$)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

(1) Develop and maintain systems to assess and track student mastery of standards. More one-on-one help is currently available to students that are struggling due to an increase in staff since SY 2018-2019. (subgroup:Caucasian)

Evidence-based Strategy: (2) Increased use of cooperative learning groups. The teacher as a facilitator of a cooperative learning group encourages communication among peer groups. Gestures and private praise should be used as a way of communicating. (subgroup: Hispanic)

(3) Teacher-directed instruction in, and practice with skills review. Real-word applications to make learning math relevant to real-life situations. Teacher-led small group instruction to supplement APEX online program. (subgroup: economically disadvantaged)

(1) Data collected from district progress monitoring tool will be used to track student growth by standard. FSA scores will be used to determine student growth which will impact the DSS school improvement rating. Research also supports individualized instruction as a primary causal strategy influencing gains in mathematics. (subgroup: Caucasian)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: (2) Use of cooperative learning groups that are more peer lead/teacher facilitated will allow the teacher to observe and implement communication techniques that lend to greater participation and growth among Hispanic students. Allowing the Hispanic students to participate in learning activities in a group setting releases some of the fear of being singled out among peers while also allowing for the teacher to offer praise and feedback in a way that does not cause unnecessary discomfort. The purpose of cooperative learning groups is to make each member a stronger individual in his or her right. Students learn together through face-to-face interaction so that they can subsequently perform higher as individuals. (subgroup: Hispanic)

(3) Research shows that children entering public schools from economically disadvantaged households have less educated parents than those from more affluent homes. Poorer students are less likely to have traveled or been exposed to the fine arts. Economically challenged children lack the background knowledge of their more financially secure counterparts. For this reason, it is important to make real world connections to make the students understand "why" they need to learn the work they are being asked to do. (subgroup: economically disadvantaged)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Additional staff on hand to provide more individualized assistance
2. Embedded scaffolding during the school day
3. Remediation and extra help offerings both before and after school
4. Direct taught mathematics instruction as opposed to strictly computer-based deliver of content material
5. Remediation lesson planning based on progress monitoring data to address areas of deficit on an individual basis
6. Addition of an ESE certified teacher

Person Responsible Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

#3. Other specifically relating to School Attendance and Graduation Rate

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students cannot learn if they are not present at school. Alternative schools have additional challenges with regard to absences because they are often the "last chance" placement option for those that are habitually truant or likely to drop-out.

Graduation rate for DAP was a mere 10%. SY 18-19 showed an increase in graduation rate to 26%.

DSS plans to increase attendance rates to >80% which is considerably higher than the standard attendance during SY 2018-2019.

Measurable Outcome: DSS hopes to maintain the percentage of students taking state-mandated assessments. In SY 18-19, 92% of students enrolled tested. The goal for SY 2020-2021 is that >90% of students are tested to meet the minimum requirement to be eligible for the highest school improvement ranking.

The graduation rate will increase by at least 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- (1) Recognition of students with perfect attendance in a given timeframe.
- (2) Daily robo calls home for all students absent from school.
- (3) Phone calls home for all students missing 2 or more consecutive unexcused absences.
- (4) Home visits for students absent more than -X- number of days over a given time period.
- (5) Attendance contracts for students with -X- number of unexcused absences over a given time period.
- (6) Referrals to Cins/Fins or truancy court for students that have been unsuccessful in adhering to attendance contracts or District attendance requirements as outlined in the Student Handbook and on the District website.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- (1) Students are typically receptive to positive recognition. At-risk students, which represent a considerable percentage of most alternative schools, are not accustomed to positive feedback and generally respond well to incentives and encouragement.
- (2) Contacts home for absent students help keep parents/guardians aware of student absences. With secondary students, there is a higher propensity for absenteeism without parent/guardian knowledge.
- (3) Contracts make students and parents/guardians more accountable for improving students attendance. The signatures designate that those signing are promising to adhere to the criteria outlined in the contract. This contract is admissible at truancy court.
- (4) Parents seeking assistance with their children with regard to school attendance may request assistance from an outside entity such as Cins/Fins or the YMCA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Daily tracking of attendance;
2. Parent/Guardian contact made for student absences;
3. Home visits for students with excessive absences;
4. Attendance contracts with parent and student signatures guaranteeing improved attendance effort;
5. Student and/or family counseling referrals for habitually truant students; and
6. Truancy court intervention as recommended by Director of Students Services.

Person Responsible Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase parental involvement in student learning and overall school-experience. Students with support outside of the school building are more likely to achieve. Encouraging parents and other stakeholders to encourage student learning and growth will promote academic achievement for affected students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of activities offered to parents, whether face to face opportunities or those available for participation virtually.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Design outreach strategies, actions, and outcomes utilizing Epstein's Six Levels of Participation to increase parental/community engagement at each level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Epstein's Six Levels of Parent Involvement has been used international as guide for school's to follow to build and implement successful parent/community involvement plans that have resulted in improvements in areas including, but not limited to: student achievement, school attendance, student behavior and engagement, and an overall better school climate.

Action Steps to Implement

- (1) Review past parent involvement practices and determine effectiveness and past participation to develop a baseline.
- (2) Outline activities and outreach efforts throughout the school year and identify action steps for each activity.
- (3) Improve communication with parents through the publication of a monthly newsletter that will be distribute to students and published online as well.
- (4) Encourage parents/family members to serve as guest speakers (ie: firefighters, medical professionals, bankers, linesmen, plumbers, etc.)
- (5) Create at home learning activities for students and parents/guardians to complete together

Person Responsible Sally McGill (sally.mcgill@desotoschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- (1) Maintain and continue to improve the positive climate and culture**
- (2) Reestablish the school "family atmosphere" present in SY 2017-2018 and SY 2018-2019 that resulted in 100% employee retention.**
- (3) Follow up with set school-wide expectations for staff and student attendance**
- (4) Recognize and incentivize both students and staff for (a) attendance and (b) exemplary effort and dedication put forth to make DSS a positive learning environment.**

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.

DeSoto Secondary School has reached out to several community members to help provide resources to improve the relationships between parents, students, families, staff, and students. Several businesses have provided incentives that will be used to help promote family involvement at school activities. Some contributors include Walmart, Publix, McDonald's, Chili's, State Farm Insurance, the Mott family as well as others.

Through the use of social media platforms and district web-page, DSS is better able to share the goings-on of the school as well as share information concerning upcoming events such as open houses, College and Career days, voter registration opportunities, and Title One activity nights. In addition to using the internet to distribute information, newsletters including event announcements will be sent home with students.

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: Other: School Attendance and Graduation Rate	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00