Orange County Public Schools

William R Boone High

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 10

Planning for Improvement 20

Positive Culture & Environment 23

Budget to Support Goals 0

William R Boone High

1000 E KALEY ST, Orlando, FL 32806

https://boonehs.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Hector Maestre

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2020-21 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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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	

* 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 Orange 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 20

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

William R Boone High

1000 E KALEY ST, Orlando, FL 32806

https://boonehs.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

OCPS Mission - With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

OCPS Vision - To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johns, Dusty	Principal	Principal of School, oversee all operations of school
Guastella, Lenore	Assistant Principal	Technology and math department
Jacobson, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	discipline, facilities, and ELA
Mixson, Candice	Assistant Principal	ESE, science, CTE, SAC
Dixon, Keith	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Faculty PD, AP testing, New Teacher Mentor Program
	Staffing Specialist	ESE compliance
Morales, Amy	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL testing and compliance
Williams, Jerry	Dean	security and discipline transportation
Windt, Joe	Dean	security and discipine
Turley, Kimberly	Instructional Media	canvas, textbooks, student IDs
Fink, Lee-ann	Assistant Principal	retired API, waiting on new AP

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2015, Hector Maestre

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.*

3

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

168

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,847

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	645	782	709	711	2847
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	243	200	212	795
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	52	40	35	148
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	140	132	108	492
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	100	100	136	457
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	155	94	98	441
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	130	88	50	370
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	186	102	100	601

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	165	214	168	185	732

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	1	5	5	10	21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	770	729	730	631	2860
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	87	117	137	441
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	26	47	31	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	169	154	141	618
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	126	183	146	568
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	108	122	104	497
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	104	70	111	427

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	209	164	194	184	751

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4	21

2020-21 - 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	770	729	730	631	2860
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	87	117	137	441
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	26	47	31	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	169	154	141	618
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	126	183	146	568
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	108	122	104	497
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	104	70	111	427

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	209	164	194	184	751

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4	21

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	55%	56%	63%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	53%	51%	52%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	40%	42%	39%	40%	44%
Math Achievement				53%	43%	51%	60%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				60%	49%	48%	49%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	46%	45%	49%	39%	45%
Science Achievement				78%	70%	68%	76%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				82%	73%	73%	79%	69%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	65%	52%	13%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	62%	50%	12%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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
2021					
2019	75%	67%	8%	67%	8%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	69%	10%	70%	9%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	50%	63%	-13%	61%	-11%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Our team used Performance Matters to run a Scoreboard report of the PMA results for the 2020-2021 school year. Within the report we added student filters for the ESSA categories ED, SWD, and ELL. This allowed us to make a comparison longitudinal, as well as, compare our overall scores to the various subgroups. In addition, we used the Baseball Card to identify the percentage of students at a level 3 or higher for Biology and Mathematics.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	57	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	45	53
	Students With Disabilities	NA	22	15
	English Language Learners	0	23	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	NA	60	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	60	63
	Students With Disabilities	NA	41	53
	English Language Learners		58	69
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	63	85	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	76	70
	Students With Disabilities	58	70	55
	English Language Learners	30	38	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68	57	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	44	44
	Students With Disabilities	31	23	17
	English Language Learners	46	20	14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	NA	54	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	45	43
	Students With Disabilities	NA	27	24
	English Language Learners	NA	39	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	24	37	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	34	25
	Students With Disabilities	14	23	10
	English Language Learners	21	33	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	33	40	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	33	33
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	0
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	67	75	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	64	55
	Students With Disabilities	37	43	36
	English Language Learners	33	35	24

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20**	**C & C Accel 2019-20**
SWD	12	26	24	16	20	17	35	46		94	26
ELL	24	52	53	28	35	36	45	29		100	55
ASN	70	76					82	100		100	78
BLK	42	50	46	28	24	29	58	73		99	47
HSP	46	50	41	28	32	31	57	59		99	63

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	71	62		31	8		72	91		100	69
WHT	73	60	49	49	33	19	83	85		98	79
FRL	45	50	41	28	27	29	56	63		98	58

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	22	35	37	25	49	52	48	52		90	27
ELL	25	43	39	27	57	59	38	48		96	70
ASN	84	79		58			95	91		97	90
BLK	48	55	46	39	57	61	66	72		100	40
HSP	54	52	43	44	60	66	66	72		96	60
MUL	68	61		41	64		75	86		100	72
WHT	80	65	40	66	61	54	88	90		99	68
FRL	52	52	42	43	60	64	65	71		97	58

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	32	26	28	38	33	35	39		83	17
ELL	13	34	33	39	43	26	40	33		86	59
ASN	83	56		92	64		92			100	69
BLK	45	44	39	51	42	60	61	63		91	34
HSP	48	48	38	55	52	49	67	65		94	54
MUL	66	55		43	58		70	83		100	69
WHT	76	57	41	65	46	39	86	91		98	65
FRL	49	46	36	51	49	50	68	65		95	43

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In five out of the eight areas being compared, the Students with Disabilities performed lower than any other subgroup. This includes, 9th grade ELA, Mathematics, 10th grade Mathematics, Biology, and 11th grade Biology. In the areas of 9th grade Biology, 10th ELA and 11th grade US History our English Language Learners performed lower than any other group of students. It is also important to note that Economically Disadvantage students on average only had 8% less students proficient than the overall student population. Whereas, SWD had on average 25% less students proficient and ELL subgroup had 24% less students proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2019 EOC comparison, Biology demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. On PMA 3, only 52% of the student were at proficiency level. This shows a 23% decrease from the Biology EOC results in 2019.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Biology requires students to complete hands on labs and interact with the knowledge they are gaining. They must apply it and prove hypothesis by conducting research and labs. In addition, it heavily relies on students ability to collaborate with a group. While teachers did their best to adapt, demonstrating labs via Microsoft Teams, finding videos that demonstrate findings they were learning about; students were lacking in the application.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2019 Algebra 1 EOC results, this area showed the greatest improvement. Student proficiency increased from 50% to 65% on PMA 3.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Teachers worked hard to ensure curriculum was standards aligned and teachers stayed true to test item specifications. During COVID the implemented many new technology engagement activities to reinforce the algebra skills.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

There will need to be focus on the ELL and SWD subgroups. By implementing strategies to specifically support this population will only continue to improve overall student proficiency. This school year, we will be implementing interventionist within the ELA, Math, Biology, and US History classrooms. They will primarily focus on supporting the lower 25% of the population. In addition, the support facilitation schedule has been modified to provide a schedule to help these individuals efficiently support ESE students that receive this service.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

During pre-planning week teachers will receive training on the non-negotiables at Boone HS. This will include training on strategies for teaching bell to bell and ensure your classroom is student centered, including ways to incorporate engagement strategies. In addition, there will be a training on how to use the CRM to drive standards-aligned instruction. Throughout the school year interventionist will be active members in the PLCs and have a PLC of their own. This will allow them to participants in what students will be learning and plan as a group on how they will support that learning with the lower 25% of students.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

There will be consistent monitoring and feedback provided among the support facilitation staff. Their classroom schedules will be reevaluated and revised if necessary to meet the needs of the students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to Panorama data only 33% of students have a sense of belonging.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase from 33% to 50% on the Panorama survey for 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	We will conduct various SEL surveys with students throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Keith Dixon (keith.dixon@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement SEL training for staff during pre-planning, incorporate class activities provided by student services department for first ten days of school, and reinstate school activities that allow for socializing and students to identify as part of Boone HS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need strategies they can use in their classroom. Throughout pre-planning we modeled many strategies and then provided them with strategies at the start of school year.

Action Steps to Implement

The SEL Site Team will be completing SEL site walks throughout the year to ensure that SEL practices are being use and being used correctly by classroom teachers

Person Responsible	Keith Dixon (keith.dixon@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to PMA 3 data, only 31% of Students with Disabilities performed at level 3, 4, or 5 in ELA Grade 10.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase from 31% to 50% on the 2021-2022 PMA 3 date for ELA Grade 10.
Monitoring:	Our teachers are using the culminating tasks and PMA data to monitor SWD progress towards proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Jacobson (kimberly-dawn.jacobson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers are following the CRM, using standard-based grading, and our support facilitators have been provided a class schedule to follow to ensure every SWD that receives that services is getting that support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By using the CRMs and grading for mastery, students will be able to monitor student progress towards mastery. We will be able to identify which standards may need remediation.

Action Steps to Implement	
Daily classroom walk throughs to monitor that teachers are on track with the CRM, level of rigor is appropriate, and students are prepared for culminating tasks	
Person Responsible	Dusty Johns (dusty.johns@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

At Boone HS we rank in the moderate range. We were 217 out of 505 high schools in the state and 11 out of 26 high schools in the county. When looking specifically at our school data, we decreased by 7% in suspensions of black students and 2% of hispanic students. We noticed that were some L1 and L2 suspensions, however that has been reevaluated to ensure proper interventions are in place prior to students being suspended. Overall, 81% of our suspensions are males and 55% are males of color. Along with students coming back face-to-face to provide more opportunities for students to build relationships with adults on campus, we will provide extra tools for teachers to build relationships with students starting the first day of school.

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.

At Boone HS, we have established an SEL team comprised of various stakeholders. This team develops professional development for the staff periodically throughout the school. We will kick of our SEL training during pre-planning week with a virtual training for staff to attend. In addition, our CRT will provide training to staff on how to embed SEL strategies into the classroom. There will be goals that are monitored for each nine weeks.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The various stakeholders include parents' role is participation in PTSO and SAC. Students are also stakeholders. They promote a positive culture and environment by not only getting involved in Boone HS extracurricular activities but by setting a good example while participating in these events and demonstrating good sportsmanship. In addition, staff members play a major role in promoting positivity by incorporating social-emotional learning strategies in their classroom and on campus. They develop relationships with students that provide them a safe adult on campus.