High Springs Community School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

https://www.sbac.edu/highsprings

Demographics

Principal: Lynn Mcneill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	46%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Alachua 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

High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

https://www.sbac.edu/highsprings

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

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 Alachua 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.

High Springs Community School contributes to the improvement of self, family, community, and nation.

We are committed to the success of every student!

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders work collaboratively to ensure the social, emotional and academic success of each student.

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
McNeill, Lynn	Principal	
BISHOP, EMERY	Assistant Principal	
Bourg, Robin	Assistant Principal	
Butts, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Cummings, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Morrison, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Register, Loretta	Teacher, K-12	
Rendek, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Beckett, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
Lovins, Lena	Teacher, K-12	
McElroy, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Taylor, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Obenour, Kimberly	Teacher, ESE	
McLeod, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/12/2015, Lynn Mcneill

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.*

6

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

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,000

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

5

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	79	102	109	117	116	98	116	108	124	0	0	0	0	969
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	15	6	17	9	30	12	24	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	1	8	14	15	11	5	22	26	27	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in Math	1	4	12	3	10	11	22	20	25	0	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	14	16	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15	12	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	6	9	7	11	6	25	23	30	0	0	0	0	118

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	1	7	4	3	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

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	76	79	100	99	70	102	110	108	89	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	14	5	9	10	10	9	5	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	2	3	2	1	1	5	16	22	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	6	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	20	14	18	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	24	12	7	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	1	1	1	1	8	18	16	19	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	76	79	100	99	70	102	110	108	89	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	14	5	9	10	10	9	5	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	2	3	2	1	1	5	16	22	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	6	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	20	14	18	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	24	12	7	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	1	1	1	1	8	18	16	19	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4

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				63%	65%	61%	64%	61%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	60%	59%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	54%	45%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				69%	58%	62%	70%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains				74%	59%	59%	59%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	56%	52%	49%	50%	52%
Science Achievement				65%	60%	56%	68%	65%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				88%	84%	78%	84%	76%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2021					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
07	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	52%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2021					
	2019	81%	52%	29%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2021					
	2019	75%	59%	16%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	27%	15%	46%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	55%	4%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	48%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	88%	69%	19%	71%	17%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	56%	26%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

AIMS; DIBELS, ISIP

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58.8	64.3	57.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.4	56.8	52.6
	Students With Disabilities	42.2	49.5	52.4
	English Language Learners	50.0	44.9	49.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74.2	65.2	79.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	64.9	59.4	74.3
	Students With Disabilities	62.2	71.7	62.9
	English Language Learners	66.7	66.7	28.6

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59.6	60.8	68.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.5	55.1	62.9
	Students With Disabilities	43.5	41.4	44.2
	English Language Learners	76.2	93.8	76.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78.4	73.8	70.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	75.5	71.7	62.8
	Students With Disabilities	72.2	55.8	57.1
	English Language Learners	88.9	72.7	75.0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50.2	51.2	59.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.8	48.4	51.4
	Students With Disabilities	37.3	30.4	37.8
	English Language Learners	40.0	73.3	77.8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62.4	55.4	69.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	57.3	48.8	62.6
	Students With Disabilities	52.5	37.5	56.8
	English Language Learners	87.5	87.5	88.9
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65.1	68.1	56.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	57.9	62.3	49.6
	Students With Disabilities	56.7	50.0	38.1
	English Language Learners	77.8	86.4	95.0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.8	50.6	59.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.1	45.0	51.2
	Students With Disabilities	41.0	45.1	43.8
	English Language Learners	43.8	63.0	60.9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61.6	36.9	42.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.1	36.3	34.2
	Students With Disabilities	44.4	33.3	26.7
	English Language Learners	55.6	33.3	26.7

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60.8	61.4	74.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.0	57.9	68.4
	Students With Disabilities	39.6	56.3	67.0
	English Language Learners	12.5	NA	70.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48.1	54.5	41.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.9	47.2	36.8
	Students With Disabilities	35.6	43.3	35.2
	English Language Learners	33.3	NA	40.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	63.6	64.2	71.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	57.3	59.0	71.1
	Students With Disabilities	53.3	55.1	65.0
	English Language Learners	80.0	60.0	85.2

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61.0	57.8	66.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	59.9	60.0	63.0
	Students With Disabilities	48.7	41.7	42.2
	English Language Learners	NA	44.4	53.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51.7	47.5	55.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.7	37.6	46.1
	Students With Disabilities	33.3	40.0	60.0
	English Language Learners	20.0	46.7	20.0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59.1	52.7	68.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.1	46.7	61.2
	Students With Disabilities	37.8	39.6	48.8
	English Language Learners	38.5	41.7	57.1

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	19	34	26	30	42	31	14	44			
ELL	30			50							
BLK	41	51	27	41	51	38	21	73			
HSP	61	68	57	64	56	23	63	93	90		
MUL	45	50		54	42						
WHT	65	62	44	72	67	49	61	89	89		
FRL	41	49	35	49	54	43	38	84	75		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	43	41	30	60	54	41	53			
BLK	32	46	42	47	69	67	19	64			
HSP	65	63	50	65	67	57	68				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
MUL	76	71		90	88						
WHT	68	61	51	72	75	61	72	91	77		
FRL	45	54	46	54	66	61	47	76	73		

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	27	24	16	32	40	42	24				
BLK	29	39	34	30	41	50	25	67			
HSP	67	55	25	67	67	57	68				
MUL	58	53		79	67						
WHT	70	61	54	77	61	47	75	85	86		
FRL	53	53	41	58	54	48	59	76	81		

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	63
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	64
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	48
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	66
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	52
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?

Based on the FDOE school grades report, HSCS earned a total of 608 points and a grade of A in 2019. Currently, the ACPS Director | Data Analytics, Evaluation & Accountability projects HSCS earned a total of 563 points based on the 2021 FSA. This would also be a grade of A for 2021. In 2019 the lowest quartile percentages for both ELA and Math were similar or even higher than the overall achievement and overall learning gains. Currently, the lowest quartile learning gains for both ELA and Math were approximately 20% lower than the overall learning gains.

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

The greatest areas of need for improvement this year are lowest quartile students in the areas of ELA and Math making their annual learning gains.

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

A targeted focus on the lowest quartile students must be in place. This begins with teachers receiving a list of all student scores including their lowest quartile students and the gains each of these students must make to ensure their annual learning gains. Next, teachers and administration will determine best research-based interventions to implement for these students. Progress monitoring will be done throughout the school year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains. In 2018, the percentage making learning gains was 59%. In 2019, the percentage making math learning gains was 74%.

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

HSCS has been using the Task Questioning Evidence model for math instruction K-8. Professional development for teachers began three years ago and has continued each year. Grade levels focus on "Big Rocks", or key standards that are absolutely necessary for students to master in order to be successful at the next grade level. The key standards are reviewed with grade levels above and below for meaningful vertical alignment.

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

We will continue to implement the support facilitation model for exceptional education students and struggling students in grades 3-8.

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.

All ELA teachers will be provided professional development to implement the new ELA series adopted by the district. K-2 teachers will be provided ongoing professional development to learn how to implement the UFLI instructional model and intervention model.

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

In grades K-2 the UFLI instruction and intervention model will be in the first year of implementation. This will include two intervention para-professionals who will work with lowest quartile students one on one and in very small groups. In addition, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Learning Skills assessments will be done three times or more throughout the year to determine if adequate progress is being made.

In the area of Math we are currently exploring Delta and IXL Math as supplemental resources for grades 6-8 math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With a heavy emphasis the last four years on improving math proficiency, HSCS made exceptional learning gains in the area of math based on the 2019 FSA results. When comparing the math proficiency to ELA proficiency, 69% of HSCS students were proficient in math versus only 63% of HSCS students being proficient in ELA. Even more significant is the difference in learning gains. 74% of HSCS students made learning gains in math based on the 2019 FSA results. However, only 59% of HSCS students made learning gains in the area of ELA. 63% of HSCS lowest quartile made learning gains in math and only 48% of HSCS lowest quartile students made learning gains in ELA. These results indicate the need for a continued emphasis on math proficiency and a more strategic emphasis on ELA proficiency. Tentatively, it appears the learning gains as demonstrated on the FSA for the lowest quartile in ELA are 20% below the overall learning gains in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of lowest quartile students making their annual learning gains in the areas of ELA as measured by the FSA will increase by at least 5%.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will include AIMS assessments for grades 3-8 and DIBELS assessments in grades K-5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	EMERY BISHOP (bishopbe@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A. Universal Design for Learning K-8 Teacher PLC - year long; B. Leadership Team year-long PLC focused on research-based instructional strategies in ELA, using assessment data to determine next steps for instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A. Our main goal of this UDL study is to meet the needs of all students in general education, and inclusion classrooms, to the greatest extent possible. In order to close the achievement gap, teachers must better understand how to provide instruction in a variety of ways and allow students to demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways. Teachers will meet to go through the research-based practices associated with UDL and evaluate potential approaches to using UDL in their current classrooms. They will learn about the UDL framework and incorporate materials, techniques, and strategies for delivering instruction so that students may demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways. B. Our main goal for our ELA Leadership Team PLC is to assist grade level teams with targeting standards and determine where instruction may need to be adjusted to maximize student achievement. Strategies and assessment data will be analyzed and shared at both the Leadership Team PLC and with grade level teams.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	63% of HSCS students were proficient in the area of ELA based on the 2019 FSA results. However, 32% of the African American population at HSCS were proficient in the area of ELA based on the 2019 FSA results. This is almost a 50% achievement gap between African American students and the overall HSCS student population.
Measurable Outcome:	African American students at HSCS will increase proficiency in the area of ELA by 10% based on the 2022 FSA ELA results.
Monitoring:	AIMS assessments, DIBELS assessments, ELA curriculum assessments, iStation and iReady assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	EMERY BISHOP (bishopbe@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Universal Design for Learning school-wide PLC -UDL requires teachers to present information in a variety of ways, allows students options for learning and demonstrating their knowledge, and incorporates practices that maximize student engagement. Teachers will meet to go through the research-based practices associated with UDL and evaluate potential approaches to using UDL in their current classrooms. They will learn about the UDL framework and incorporate materials, techniques, and strategies for delivering instruction so that students may demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways. Be provided with support from the district Equity department to assist with strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Because there is a 50% achievement gap in the area of ELA proficiency between African American students at HSCS and the overall student population at HSCS, there is a strong need for research-based strategies to be implemented.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Universal Design for Learning school-wide PLC (Year Long)
2. Review assessment data quarterly for monitoring and adjustment purposes
3. Provide professional development at faculty meetings - Done by Equity Mentors and/or
guest trainers
4. Access support from the district Equity department to assist school with needs

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

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.

HSCS reported 1.2 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the statewide combination school rate of 1.6 incidents per 100 students. HSCS reported 5.9 suspensions per 100 students. There were 60 total suspension days.

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.

Communication is key to building a positive school culture. Following a school year with students moving back and forth from digital academy to brick and mortar, it is more important than ever to communicate regularly with students, families of students, teachers, staff members, and community partners in order to facilitate school
improvement. Some of the communication tools to be used are as follows:

-Skylert Family Messaging System
-School Newsletter
-Weekly Newsletter to Faculty and Staff
-School Website and Individual Teacher Websites
-Regular Email Communication
-HSCS Twitter Announcements
-HSCS PTSA Facebook Page Announcements

Another important communication tool we plan to use are surveys. We will survey teachers, parents, and specific groups of students to ascertain their input regarding the school's performance in the following areas, but not limited to:

school culture
instruction and learning
equity
discipline
safety
administration

The results of these surveys are utilized to adjust and create new plans for improving any or all of the these areas.

In addition to multi level communication, HSCS celebrates achievement and good behavior. In grades K-5, we have a student of the week program where positive character traits are emphasized and rewarded. There is also a "High Flying Hawk Award" program where students are acknowledged for going above and beyond. Middle school students earn "Reward Days" each nine weeks for having little to no referrals. Staff members are acknowledged for their above and beyond work or kindness through the weekly communication, The School Scoop. Staff Shout Out forms are also available to all staff members to provide acknowledge to fellow staff members for their hard work or kind deeds.

One of our key stakeholder groups is the HSCS School Advisory Council. The SAC provides input regarding the use of Advance Placement funds and Lottery funds. The Council reviews teacher requests for funding and determines whether or not the requests support the school's plan for improvement. The SAC membership
includes teachers, support personnel, parents, and community members.

The HSCS PTSA is a strong supporter of students and teachers often organizing events to show appreciation to teachers and staff members. The PTSA also organizes fun events for students, fundraisers, and financially supports teacher requests for classroom materials and supplies.

HSCS is fortunate to have numerous local organizations who support the school financially and by donating school supplies.

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

Administration - Provide leadership regarding communication and monitor communication; Support quality instruction by organizing professional development and providing feedback in regard to instruction.
Instructional Staff - Provide positive classroom environments that promote good social and communication skills.
Guidance Staff- Provide lessons, resources, and counseling for students in order to promote social and emotional health.
HSCS PTSA - Supports Teachers and students in most any manner that is determined to be an area of need.
HSCS Business Partners- Provide supplies and incentives for both students and teachers.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00