
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

South Fork High School

10000 SW BULLDOG WAY, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/sfhs

Demographics

Principal: Tim Aitken

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2017

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)	51%
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 (59%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Martin 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

South Fork High School

10000 SW BULLDOG WAY, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/sfhs

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>42%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>48%</p>

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 Martin 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.

Every student at South Fork High School will graduate with their cohort, equipped with the skills to be college or career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Fork High School provides a safe environment for a diverse community of students to become lifelong learners through a rigorous academic curriculum.

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
Blavatt, Jay	Principal	
Connolly, Andrew	Assistant Principal	
Geiger, Edmund	Assistant Principal	
Scott, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Support Literacy
Klinedinst, Darcy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/6/2017, Tim Aitken

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

99

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)	51%
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 (59%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546	471	471	412	1900
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	42	44	63	218
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	3	5	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	25	23	35	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	36	27	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	95	88	77	380
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	50	37	40	192
	0	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	83	68	64	64	279

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	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	2	3	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/6/2020

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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	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	545	470	469	411	1895
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	41	44	62	216
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	3	4	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	46	72	75	240
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	143	125	117	570

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	85	67	69	70	291

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	1	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	2	3	18

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	58%	71%	56%	58%	67%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	59%	51%	50%	56%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	55%	42%	31%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	69%	51%	63%	63%	49%
Math Learning Gains	42%	52%	48%	61%	62%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	45%	53%	59%	39%
Science Achievement	71%	82%	68%	64%	76%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	84%	73%	72%	79%	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	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%
	2018	58%	62%	-4%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	52%	59%	-7%	53%	-1%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

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	70%	74%	-4%	67%	3%
2018	68%	73%	-5%	65%	3%
Compare		2%			

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	76%	78%	-2%	70%	6%
2018	71%	74%	-3%	68%	3%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	75%	-24%	61%	-10%
2018	50%	70%	-20%	62%	-12%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	65%	-8%	57%	0%
2018	55%	61%	-6%	56%	-1%
Compare		2%			

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	19	37	32	29	33	31	37	46		95	30
ELL	18	26	23	36	29	35	37	42		66	33
ASN	94	73					90			100	90
BLK	45	54	52	29	39	55	59	69		97	25
HSP	40	39	28	43	35	30	57	63		76	47
MUL	61	57		38				83			
WHT	69	61	47	66	47	48	81	85		97	74
FRL	43	45	34	44	34	36	59	65		85	47

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	18	29	29	31	32	29	23	48		69	32
ELL	15	31	32	33	40	42	35	21		62	42
ASN	88	50		82	91			88			
BLK	36	43	42	38	42	43	43	58		83	28
HSP	41	42	33	43	42	40	55	51		74	54
MUL	64	59		64	68		83				
WHT	68	56	34	61	56	36	80	80		91	76
FRL	43	43	32	45	47	43	59	58		77	49

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	18	33	27	37	52	47	38	53		75	23
ELL	18	27	23	41	44	43	26	41		72	38
ASN	76	90		59	60			90		100	60
BLK	36	33	5	36	40	39	43	60		85	37
HSP	41	38	26	55	53	49	48	49		82	53
MUL	72	41		58	61		82				
WHT	67	56	40	70	67	58	72	84		93	66
FRL	44	40	26	55	56	53	52	58		80	47

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
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	52
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	47
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	60
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	68
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	50
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.

Math Achievement (Algebra & Geometry) has the lowest proficiency rate of all high stakes assessments. Enhanced oversight of PLC and assessment modules written at the level of rigor.

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

Learning Gains for Math students saw a 9 point decline. Additionally there was a 9 point slide of African American students proficiency compared to 17-18. Few students testing disproportionately skew result percentages.

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.

ELA Achievement compared to MCSD avg (-13). ELL & ESE. Factors contributing to this gap include the impact of intensive reading curriculum for second language learners, evaluating the levels of support offered for ESE students.

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

+11 USH Black, +12 Hispanic, +21 ELL Performance
+14% Black, +26 ESE graduation rate
Biology subgroup performance across the board, (+14 ESE)

Increased focus on ELL acquisition of vocabulary, and use of info graphics for US History.
Biology PLC unified focus and highly aligned and rigorous assessments.
Graduation rates increased due to increased scrutiny of early warning systems.

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

Increased number of FRL and ELL student enrollment- prior-prior 9th grade ELA testers in US History. Math Achievement specifically large group testing Geometry.

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

1. Geometry Achievement,
2. Math Achievement, BQ and traditional gains
3. ELA Achievement
4. College & Career Readiness
5. Increase Graduation Rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Enhance student performance in Algebra testing- 234 Algebra testers, 71 are Bottom Quartile, of that 51 are ELL, 10 ESE.
 Increase student performance in Geometry testing: 239 prior-prior testers, ?? testers from Alg for graduation requirement? BQ of prior prior is 3 students- 1 ELL, 1 ESE OHI

Measurable Outcome: Maintain 81% achievement compared to 18-19, increase learning gains from 39 to 50%, maintain 67% BQ learning gains

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Janice Cizek (cizekj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: (Geometry) Looping teachers, academic boot camp, PLC short term common formative assessments to design instruction, Common Quarterly Assessments are designed for summative assessments, instructional planning days to design assessment aligned to the standards, engaging in data dialogues with each evaluator.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Short time cycle assessments allow intentional remediation and enrichment to occur. Data dialogues include analyzing the blue print for the End of Course assessments. This work helps to design questions that are comparable to the level of questioning the state assessment expects, in regards to rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff and schedule appropriately
2. Share prior year performance
3. Diagnostic assessment
4. Creation of Common Formative Assessments aligned to standards. Internal planning day to create assessments modeled on EOC question styles and content.
- 5 Regular assessment intervals.
6. Data Dialogues

Person Responsible Janice Cizek (cizekj@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The performance of our English Language Learners is 37%, which falls below the federal index of 41%. Students who are identified with an LY status need the supplemental supports in all content areas. In order for students to thrive in reading comprehension, they need intentional explicit instruction on vocabulary, graphic organizers, etc.

Measurable Outcome: English Language Learners will reach 41% proficiency by the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Connolly (connola@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategies that will be implemented for this area of Focus is to provide teachers with the time to intentionally plan and design their lessons. PLCs focus on specific short term formative assessments to track current student level of performance. Lesson plans will reflect evidence based strategies such as explicit, systematic vocabulary instruction, designing activities to use graphic organizers, chunking the text, summarizing, etc. WICOR strategies are also included in best practices for all student performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify our ELL students.
2. Determine students current level of performance, in both WIDA and state assessment.
3. Training on how to interpret WIDA results.
4. Data dialogues.
5. Targeted family communication - Indiantown Family Conference nights.
6. Establish school wide ELL instructional strategies toolkit.

Person Responsible: Andrew Connolly (connola@martinschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities are currently 39% proficient on assessments, the federal index is a 41%.

Measurable Outcome: Students with Disabilities will be 41% proficient at the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edmund Geiger (geigere@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Support Facilitators are scheduled into specific classrooms to support students with disabilities. In addition, Support Facilitators are assigned a caseload of 20-25 students in which they are tasked with monitoring success and mastery of standards. They are also active members of their PLC and an integral part of designing assessments and sharing instructional strategies to support students. Student support center is available for students who need additional supports in their academic courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing the supports available to students, and providing additional opportunities for students to connect with staff members will give students the tools they need achieve mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Middle School transition meetings to capture an overall picture of the student as a learner and make the transition to high school a smoother one.
2. Scheduling of school personnel to provide students with the environment and academic supports they need to be successful.
3. Emotional and Behavioral supports are part of our professional development plan for teachers to know and understand how behavior and barriers to learning are manifested.

Person Responsible Edmund Geiger (geigere@martinschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increased teacher and student participation, inclusion and acceptance of social emotional outlets

Measurable Outcome: Students will engage in a regular intervals of survey to assess their current needs, socially and emotionally.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Community Circles
2. Senior Mentorship Program
3. Restructuring of the PBIS program on campus to include entire student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Socially and Emotionally awareness and learning is a critical component of student success on and off a school campus. Helping to provide students the tools they need to cope with challenges and obstacles will ensure a more successful transition from high school to college/career.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Community Circles
2. PBIS restructure
3. Survey design and data review.
4. Social Emotional FOCUS group on campus to include all stakeholders.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Scott (scottj2@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Increase Graduation rate, College and Career Readiness, IB retention

Measurable Outcome: Overall graduation rate will increase from 94% to 97%, IB diploma rate from 81% to 90%. Increase the number of students college and career ready from 64% to 75%. Decrease the attrition rate of IB students by 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jay Blavatt (blavatj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Targeted early intervention strategies facilitated by district and site level graduation coaches. Partner Administrators with Guidance Counselors based on alphabet to regularly review student progression on critical performance indicators. Ongoing audit of teacher planning, communication and rigor alignment. Conduct stakeholder focus groups to evaluate SWOT of IB program. Analyze gaps in student schedule to increase opportunity for C&C readiness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order for a student to graduate they must meet all graduation requirements.

Action Steps to Implement

Graduation Rate:

1. Monitor EWS
2. Monitor teacher data
3. Conduct Data dialogues (teacher & student)
4. Communicate
5. Targeted Interventions

IB Diploma:

1. Enculturate in pre-IB program
2. Improve teacher training
3. Appropriately place students based on success and acumen
4. Oversight & Accountability

College & Career Readiness:

1. Insure Opportunities
2. Promote methods for students to be appropriately prepared to be tested
3. Promote Value of programs
4. Audit students without C&C points

Reduce Attrition:

1. Reflective analysis of IB Brand with stakeholders
2. Survey Population
3. Improve Pre-IB program

- 4. Recruit teachers
- 5. Targeted professional development - staff and students
- 6. Listen

Person Responsible Jay Blavatt (blavatj@martinschools.org)

#6. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Retention and training of staff
Measurable Outcome:	Increase opportunities for staff upward mobility with 3 year onboarding process
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrew Connolly (connola@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	3 year onboarding process
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers are happy and see value in their work, the students are happy and grow too.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Hiring Committees with question banks
- 2. New Hire mentorship
- 3. Ongoing PD led by other teachers
- 4. Exit interviews with those who leave

Person Responsible Andrew Connolly (connola@martinschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

See plan

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.

For our students to maximize their potential, it is critical that we are continually building and establishing relationships with our students and their families. We encourage parents to maintain a presence on our campus. Many of our parents volunteer on our campus, which has led to our overall volunteer service hours equaling more than twice the number of students enrolled at South Fork. We strive to stay in touch with our parents as much and in as many ways as possible throughout the year. We offer automated phone calls for important events in Spanish as well as English. We mail a semester newsletter to our families called the Bulldog Bark. Many faculty members stay in touch with parents via email and email newsletters. Our school website is regularly updated with vital dates, times, and information. Since being quarantined in the spring of 2020, we have relied heavily on our social media presence including Facebook, Instagram, twitter, remind and the suite of google products. We offer a freshmen orientation prior to the beginning of the school year, which allows students to ride the bus to school where they are introduced to administration, faculty and staff, and go through their class schedule in a condensed school day without the upperclassmen being on campus. We have an open house the first week of school so all parents have the opportunity to meet their child's teachers. In addition to our monthly SAC meetings held at South Fork, we typically hold one meeting in one of two local communities, Indiantown or Hobe Sound, so they are more accessible to more of our parents. Our SAC team is a microcosm of our school population, we rely on the SAC team to assist in our allocation of resources as well as to offer input of our community's priorities. We also hold parent-teacher conferences in Indiantown twice per year because many of these families might not attend the conferences otherwise. We encourage parental involvement in other ways, such as booster clubs, International Baccalaureate parent meetings, scholarship nights, and volunteer opportunities. Our strong extra-curricular programs also form a strong bond between our school and our families through sporting events, chorus and band concerts, plays and musicals, art shows, and many others. Our ELL department is always working with our teachers to make calls home to parents who speak other languages. Our district database program (FOCUS) includes an on-line gradebook program, which allows parents to monitor their child's progress throughout the school year.

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: Math				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0241 - South Fork High School			\$1,500.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0241 - South Fork High School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Developing and implementing teacher led PD on WIDA, distinguishing between ELL & Hispanic students. Increasing outreach events in our ELL community. Printing costs for SFHS created documents and course supplements as needed</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

			0241 - South Fork High School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Designing and implementing internal PD regarding modifications. Adaptive software (currently being vetted through ESE PLC)</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0241 - South Fork High School	School Improvement Funds		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Dr. Steve Jones- cultural sensitivity and inclusion practices training staff wide Banquet for Professional development for Passion Project Fair</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0241 - South Fork High School	Other		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: SWOT analysis and re branding initiative- IB PAC</i>			
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0241 - South Fork High School			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Banquet</i>			
					Total:	\$14,500.00