Marion County Public Schools

Forest High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Forest High School

5000 SE MARICAMP RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lamar Rembert

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	68%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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 Marion 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

Forest High School

5000 SE MARICAMP RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

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	45%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Forest High School Community is committed to providing the skills and education necessary for students to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Forest High School educational environment encourages school-to-career skill development and post-secondary education by providing a wide variety of core and elective courses, as well as sports and activities.

Forest High School provides a safe learning environment in which students can be successful as individuals, as members of a team, and within the community.

Forest High School fosters open communication between the school and home, and encourages family involvement.

Forest High School teachers are provided staff development opportunities to master technologies and instructional strategies to improve student performance.

Forest High School promotes an equal opportunity learning environment and encourages all students to respect the cultural diversity of others.

Forest High School provides motivation and encouragement to students to help them achieve their goals.

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
Brown, Elizabeth	Principal	Instructional leader that implements mission and vision of the school as well as the instructional focus. Creates climate and culture of the school through servitude leadership.
Stopyra, David	Assistant Principal	Supervisor of discipline
Wade, Michael	Assistant Principal	Supervisor of Guidance and overseer of master schedule, student schedules
Willis, Tara	Assistant Principal	Instructional support and supervisor of Instructional Coach/AVID Coordinator
Miller, William	Other	Testing Coordinator
Tucker, Donald	Other	Athletic Director
Powell, Steven	Dean	Student Discipline
Crawford, John	Magnet Coordinator	Coordinate the magnet programs
Cook, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Teacher
Stopyra, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Teacher
Miller, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Lamar Rembert

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

5

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

127

Total number of students enrolled at the school
2,247

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
127

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	610	534	513	498	2155
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	206	184	173	732
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	114	85	59	392
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	215	119	85	633
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293	221	158	77	749
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	94	71	95	382
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	73	120	124	408
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	270	249	195	143	857

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	22	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	636	582	550	517	2285
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	54	67	99	356
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	76	71	69	318
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	172
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	138	52	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	99	44	145

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	61	75	140	138	414

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	25	20	13	16	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	636	582	550	517	2285
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	54	67	99	356
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	76	71	69	318
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	172
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	138	52	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	99	44	145

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	61	75	140	138	414

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	25	20	13	16	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				58%	46%	56%	57%	44%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	48%	51%	52%	48%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	39%	42%	45%	37%	44%
Math Achievement				49%	40%	51%	51%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains				43%	43%	48%	47%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25%	37%	45%	31%	31%	45%
Science Achievement				75%	61%	68%	70%	60%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	71%	73%	78%	67%	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	63%	50%	13%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	51%	46%	5%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	74%	64%	10%	67%	7%

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	72%	70%	2%	70%	2%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	36%	54%	-18%	61%	-25%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	56%	51%	5%	57%	-1%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:
• English Language Art: ELA Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Algebra: Algebra Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Geometry: Geometry Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Biology: Biology Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• US History: District Assessment Social Studies Quarters 1, 2, and 3

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	223 / 42%	282 / 50%	243 / 45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78 / 32%	100 / 37%	76 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 6%	4 / 8%	2 / 4%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 14%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Algebra 138 / 53% Geo 103 / 61%"	"Algebra 93 / 32% Geo 131 / 72%"	"Algebra 83 / 31% Geo 116 / 65%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Algebra 72 / 47% Geo 32 / 51%"	"Algebra 51 / 30% Geo 43 / 62%"	"Algebra 41 / 27% Geo 39 / 57%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Algebra 13 / 46% Geo 2 / 100%"	"Algebra 7 / 21% Geo 2 / 50%"	"Algebra 6 / 20% Geo 1 / 25%"
	English Language Learners	"Algebra 1 / 17% Geo 1 / 100%"	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 1 / 100%"	"Algebra 1 / 17% Geo 1 / 100%"
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	152 / 78%	164 / 79%	152 / 76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43 / 77%	42 / 69%	40 / 70%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 75%	3 / 75%	3 / 100%
	English Language Learners			
	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	249 / 61%	278 / 60%	257 / 59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94 / 49%	113 / 49%	100 / 49%
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 26%	8 / 24%	7 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 17%	2 / 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Algebra 7 / 47% Geo 105 / 42%"	"Algebra 5 / 31% Geo 121 / 44%"	"Algebra 6 / 46% Geo 94 / 37%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Algebra 6 / 55% Geo 59 / 40%"	"Algebra 4 / 33% Geo 68 / 42%"	"Algebra 5 / 50% Geo 50 / 35%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Algebra 3 / 33% Geo 6 / 38%"	"Algebra 1 / 11% Geo 4 / 24%"	"Algebra 2 / 25% Geo 2 / 12%"
	English Language Learners	" Geo 1 / 25%"	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 1 / 25%"	" Geo 3 / 75%"
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	121 / 52%	140 / 43%	109 / 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63 / 47%	77 / 39%	57 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 22%	5 / 19%	2 / 8%
	English Language Learners	1 / 25%	2 / 33%	1 / 17%
	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	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 3 / 13%"	"Algebra 1 / 100% Geo 7 / 25%"	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 5 / 25%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 1 / 6%"	"Algebra 1 / 100% Geo 4 / 19%"	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 3 / 21%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 2 / 33%"	"Algebra 1 / 100% Geo 2 / 22%"	"Algebra 0 / 0% Geo 1 / 17%"
	English Language Learners	" Geo 0 / 0%"	" Geo 1 / 33%"	" Geo 0 / 0%"
	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	214 / 61%	244 / 66%	208 / 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	95 / 54%	109 / 57%	93 / 59%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 13%	5 / 14%	5 / 23%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	2 / 33%	0 / 0%

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		" Geo 0 / 0%"	" Geo 0 / 0%"
	Economically Disadvantaged		" Geo 0 / 0%"	" Geo 0 / 0%"
	Students With Disabilities		" Geo 0 / 0%"	" Geo 0 / 0%"
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0 / 0%	2 / 50%	0 / 0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	2 / 50%	0 / 0%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 50%	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	2 / 50%	2 / 40%	2 / 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 100%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%
	Students With Disabilities		0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	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	19	34	26	14	16	23	35	24		82	47
ELL	20	32	24	10	23	24	37	18		100	95
ASN	73	62					92			100	93
BLK	32	45	41	20	23	34	42	43		87	87
HSP	49	49	29	37	21	19	59	61		97	87

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	60	52	15	45	9		67	54		94	94
WHT	62	55	50	42	23	29	69	74		96	88
FRL	39	45	35	27	21	28	49	52		91	83

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	25	38	38	26	29	15	52	36		88	21
ELL	18	35	32	24	20		50	56			
ASN	61	35		45			91	90			
BLK	37	41	36	24	29	14	48	52		89	27
HSP	49	49	38	43	35	12	69	76		85	48
MUL	40	50	40	58	48		76	65		93	64
WHT	67	53	47	59	49	35	82	79		96	57
FRL	46	44	34	37	35	16	67	63		89	37

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	45	37	18	40	29	28	49		63	26
ELL	18	48	44	24	31		67			56	40
ASN	79	64		68	56		93				
BLK	32	41	40	29	40	31	45	61		85	30
HSP	48	47	46	43	47	28	67	67		78	48
MUL	41	47	43	34	26		71	64		89	48
WHT	66	56	49	60	49	33	77	86		92	56
FRL	45	46	42	44	43	32	61	69		80	39

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	54
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	39
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	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	45
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	50
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	54
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	59
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	47
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?

Trends include low growth in learning gains in Math and ELA and a decrease in achievement in US History. We have three subgroups that are below 41% achievement including SWD, ELL, and black/ African American students.

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

The lowest 25% in Math has the greatest need for improvement. Within this area, the three subgroups are an area of focus.

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

Lack of focus on effective teaching and learning strategies of high impact for low level learners contributed to this need for improvement. Lack of teacher collaboration focused on the lowest 25% is also a factor. Implementation of designated collaboration time where the only focus is the lowest 25% is necessary with follow up by utilizing high impact strategies in the classroom. Also the implementation of Intensive Math will produce positive results.

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

The area of Biology showed the most improvement.

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

Biology teachers maintained a collaborative attitude and shared best practices on a weekly basis. High impact strategies were used in the classroom as well as innovative lessons.

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

W currently have several new or beginning teachers teaching Biology. They need development in the craft of teaching. Also, the leadership team and Biology teachers need to set specific goals for student achievement this year and ensure that all work supports that goal.

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.

CAT Collaboration based on AVID High Impact Strategies and highly influential book study material. Department collaboration and grade level collaboration. Super Six planning days with a focus of student achievement and progress.

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

We will continue the Super Six planning days and Intense Days as they have proven to promote student success. We will continue to focus on collaboration and make it a priority to discuss our three subgroup areas in our meetings. We will continue to implement AVID school wide with a focus on high impact teaching and learning strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is 54%, as evidenced in 2020-2021 proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment which is a drop of 4% from the scores we previously attained in the 2018-2019 school year. 2. We expect our performance level to be 59% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the proficiency level on the FSA ELA when entering high school. We additionally, noticed a drop in our scores due to students missing nearly a semester of in person instruction and many students choosing the online school option during the 2020-2021 school year. 4. We now have our students back in in-person classes and they are able to be remediated at a higher level of rigor. If the rigor of instructional practices aligned to the appropriate level of standards would occur, and our teachers implement with fidelity AVID WICOR Strategies, we should notice an increase in our FSA State assessment scores from 54% to 59%, which is above our pre-pandemic levels.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 54% to 59%, as measured by the FSA ELA assessment. Specifically, students in the three subgroups of SWD, ELL, and Black students will increase their proficiency level by 12%.
Monitoring:	1. Daily formative teacher created progress monitoring tools. 2. Data digs of district level progress monitoring results on a quarterly basis. 3. Non evaluative coaching classroom visits. 4. One on one conversations to promote teacher craft growth. 5. Three subgroups will be monitored independently with a specific focus on growth from progress monitoring period to the next.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize collaborative teaching approaches that include hands on learning, collaborative learning, and formative assessment to monitor progress. Extra collaborative planning time will be given to Math teachers. Data digs will be utilized often to assess progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Innovative teaching styles are research proven to work with struggling students. Collaborative planning time for teachers is a best practice and lends itself to student success in the classroom. Using data to plan next lesson steps is a research based strategy to enhance student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Working with our teachers during collaborative planning sessions to develop a purpose behind every moment of instruction to allow students to extend beyond their perceived academic level.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Developing a culture of mastery during our five teacher specific book studies that will increase the level of rigor in the classroom to match or extend beyond the level of the standard being taught as well as spiraling back to encompass previous standards.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Utilizing the AVID WICOR Strategies of Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading on a daily basis to push the level of rigor to the depth of the standard so that standards based mastery can be achieved.

Person Responsible Michael Wade (michael.wade@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Further develop our positive school culture with PBIS Strategies and Attendance Interventions to encourage students to be in attendance and on time. This will decrease the gaps in their standards based instruction.

Person Responsible David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

5. Provide professional development for our staff during our whole group faculty meetings and utilizing a PBIS system that will strengthen our staff's ability to develop relationships with their students so that they are accurately able to convey the purpose of what is being taught.

Person Responsible David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

6. Provide intensive remedial classes for students that are testing below mastery to increase their level of retention and increase their learning gains.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

7. Provide specific focus to the three subgroups mentioned in the area of focus by using all the strategies listed above and gearing the data chats, book study materials, and professional development to focus on these groups. Utilizing personnel that work specifically with the subgroups to motivate and monitor progress will occur daily. Subgroups will be discussed in all MDT meetings as separate entities.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is 36%, as evidenced in 2020-2021 proficiency on the FSA Geometry and Algebra assessments which is a drop of 13% from the scores we previously attained in the 2018-2019 school year. 2. We expect our performance level to be 49% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the proficiency level on the FSA Geometry and Algebra when entering high school. We additionally, noticed a drop in our scores due to students missing nearly a semester of in person instruction and many students choosing the online school option during the 2020-2021 school year. 4. We now have our students back in in-person classes and are able to be remediated at a higher level of rigor. If the rigor of instructional practices aligned to the appropriate level of standards would occur, and our teachers implement with fidelity AVID WICOR Strategies, we should notice an increase in our FSA State assessment scores from 36% to 49%, which is at the level of our pre-pandemic scores.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving Geometry and Algebra proficiency will increase from 36% to 49%, as measured by the FSA Geometry and Algebra assessments. Specifically, students in the three subgroups of SWD, ELL, and Black students will increase their proficiency level by 12%.
Monitoring:	1. Daily formative teacher created progress monitoring tools. 2. Data digs of district level progress monitoring results on a quarterly basis. 3. Non evaluative coaching classroom visits. 4. One on one conversations to promote teacher craft growth. 5. Three subgroups will be monitored independently with a specific focus on growth from progress monitoring period to the next.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize collaborative teaching approaches that include hands on learning, collaborative learning, and formative assessment to monitor progress. Extra collaborative planning time will be given to Math teachers. Data digs will be utilized often to assess progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Innovative teaching styles are research proven to work with struggling students. Collaborative planning time for teachers is a best practice and lends itself to student success in the classroom. Using data to plan next lesson steps is a research based strategy to enhance student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Working with our teachers during collaborative planning sessions to develop a purpose behind every moment of instruction to allow students to extend beyond their perceived academic level.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Developing a culture of mastery during our five teacher specific books studies that will increase the level of rigor in the classroom to match or extend beyond the level of the standard being taught as well as spiraling back to encompass previous standards.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Utilizing the AVID WICOR Strategies of; Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading on a daily basis to push the level of rigor to the depth of the standard so that standards based mastery can be achieved.

Person Responsible Michael Wade (michael.wade@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Further develop our positive school culture with PBIS Strategies and Attendance Interventions to encourage students to be in attendance and on time. This will decrease the gaps in their standards based instruction.

Person Responsible David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

5. Provide professional development for our staff during our whole group faculty meetings and utilizing a PBIS system that will strengthen our staff's ability to develop relationships with their students so that they are accurately able to convey the purpose of what is being taught.

Person Responsible David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

6. Provide intensive remedial classes for students that are testing below mastery to increase their level of retention and increase their learning gains.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

7. Provide specific focus to the three subgroups mentioned in the area of focus by using all the strategies listed above and gearing the data chats, book study materiasl, and professional development to focus on these groups. Utilizing personnel that work specifically with the subgroups to motivate and monitor progress will occur daily. Subgroups will be discussed in all MDT meetings as separate entities.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.

Our primary area of concern is the amount of SESIR infractions among minority males. Our MDT will use weekly data to monitor trends and address focused areas through mentorship programs and PBIS techniques geared specifically toward minority males.

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.

We address building relationships through elevated moments, the PBIS spirit store ticket system, a wide variety of club and activities offerings, The Rock to assist students in needs, regular effective parent communication and community events, and inviting invested stakeholders into the school house to work with our students in a positive way.

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

Administrators: Set expectations and model positive school culture building strategies and support teachers and students.

Staff: Continuous daily building of relationships by sponsoring clubs, participating in school activities and mentoring students one on one each day in the classroom.

Parents: Support students at home and stay in regular communication with the school concerning student needs.

Business Partners and Community Members: Stay involved in school community and work with school admin to promote post secondary options for all students.