
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://blc.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: **Stephanie Palmer**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
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 Clay 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	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://blc.oneclay.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)
Combination School PK, 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2012-13
Grade	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Bannerman Learning Center's mission is to create a positive, safe and supportive environment that promotes excellence in teaching and learning. The unique potential of each individual is recognized and encouraged in a challenging and diverse setting. Through the growth and advancement of students and staff, knowledge and skills are gained to meet life's challenges and develop active, responsible citizens for our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bannerman Learning Center exists to prepare all students to be successful in a positive manner in a competitive workplace and community. Students will thrive in a safe and welcoming environment, foster mutual respect between students and staff while focusing on returning to their home school or preparing to enlist in the military, enroll in college or become gainfully employed.

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
McKinney, Mark	Principal	Responsible for implementing and facilitating PBIS programs while providing professional development for staff that fosters growth in PBIS, SEL programs, and raising the academic expectations of students, faculty and staff.
Cox, Brian	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in all aspects of instruction and operation of school functions.
McKenzie, Erin	Teacher, ESE	As Behavior Management Teacher, Ms. McKenzie will assist school-wide initiatives related to student engagement, discipline, and classroom management.
McGhghy, Linda	Dean	Responsible for implementing and facilitating PBIS programs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/22/2021, Stephanie Palmer

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

249

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

6

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	1	24	23	27	47	130	252
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	4	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	19	14	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	19	14	17	28	99

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	2	2	0	2	2	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/22/2021

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	10	21	14	28	48	95	216
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	10	21	14	28	48	95	216
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	4	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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					57%	61%		55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					53%	59%		47%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					53%	54%		43%	52%
Math Achievement					52%	62%		54%	61%
Math Learning Gains					49%	59%		49%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					46%	52%		47%	52%
Science Achievement					54%	56%		58%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		74%	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
06	2021					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	5%	59%	-54%	52%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	22%	62%	-40%	56%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
09	2021					
	2019	19%	61%	-42%	55%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
10	2021					
	2019	2%	57%	-55%	53%	-51%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	10%	70%	-60%	55%	-45%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	14%	63%	-49%	54%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
08	2021					
	2019	10%	49%	-39%	46%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	10%	64%	-54%	48%	-38%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	4%	72%	-68%	67%	-63%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	14%	80%	-66%	71%	-57%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	29%	80%	-51%	70%	-41%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	4%	65%	-61%	61%	-57%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	7%	64%	-57%	57%	-50%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Achieve baseline test for all ready, IReady for junior high math, FSA for math science and Social Studies.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	1	2
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	5	5	5
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	2	2
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4	5	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	1	2
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	1
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	5	4	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3	3	4
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	1
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	1
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	2	2	2
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3	5	5
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	2	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	3
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	3
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	3	3
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	1	1
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	1
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	1	3
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	3	3
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		0	3	3
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	1	1
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		0	1	1
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	1	1
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		0	1	1
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	38	20		17	22		27			62	16
ELL										83	10
BLK										69	4
HSP										81	5
WHT	33	10		9	6			30		61	17

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
FRL	31	20		14	27		30			64	13
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	29		17	36		20	29		28	
BLK	6	36					10			38	
WHT	19	33		14	25		15	27		30	18
FRL	13	29		21	20		14	21		22	
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

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	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	213
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	46%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	24
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance last year. The nature of our school population means the students come to this school at risk for failure. Having better communication between schools should allow this component to show greater success.

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

Math achievement has consistently been the area of greatest need for improvement.

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

Our population also continues to be very transient with a high turnover rate. We receive student throughout the year which usually creates gaps in their instruction. We are using IReady for the Junior high students and IXL for the Senior high students for remediation.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement from last year with a gain of 10%. Our increased engagement and implementation of a successful Achieve 3000 and IReady programs has help our numbers increase.

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

Our population also continues to be very transient with a high turnover rate. We receive student throughout the year which usually creates gaps in their instruction. We are using Lexia for all students.

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

We have used one class for our Elevation students as a test prep instruction. We are also using a new reading program in the district, Lexia.

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.

Discipline and Attendance continue to be an areas of concern. Most of our students arrive behind in credits with a low GPA which is a symptom of attendance and discipline issues. Increased engagement and having high expectations for all learners is key to turn these students towards success and a needed area of PD for our staff.

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

Along with our efforts of professional development in the areas of student engagement and high expectations we are also working on restorative justice which builds greater relationships among staff and students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reading is an important factor in student achievement. Based on the 20-21 testing data our students need to be proficient in reading to increase scores in multiple tested subjects. We also need to focus on improving our instruction to students with disabilities and who are economically disadvantaged.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the school year, at least 50% of the all students, SWD, african-American, White, and Economically Disadvantaged, will show learning gains on the progress monitoring assessments and reading lexile.

Monitoring: Teacher will track students progress on teacher made assessments and progress monitoring assessments prior to the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mark McKinney (mark.mckinney@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will use text annotation to make meaning and provide evidence to support answers.
Teachers will use read-discuss-read protocol in both ELS and Intensive Reading classes.
Content level teachers will encourage pre-writing and pre-reading strategies and utilize Cornell note-taking.
Students will be encouraged to immerse themselves in content-rich grade level text.
11th and 12th grade students are presented opportunities to meet concordant scores through extensive ACT and SAT preparation)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All strategies are evidence-based and provide opportunities for high levels of student engagement. Teachers will have the opportunity to provide TIER 2 and TIER 3 interventions with support from the literacy team, administration and Support Facilitator.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create an Literacy Action Team.
2. Schoolwide reading initiative using IReady and Achieve.
3. Evaluation of strategies in professional learning communities.
4. Common planning to monitor standards.
5. Coaching provided by district specialists.

Person Responsible Mark McKinney (mark.mckinney@myoneclay.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There was a spike in our referral rate last year; students should not be missing class because of discipline this takes away from their education. If we can change the mindset of students with overcoming obstacles we can increase student engagement and enhance their educational experience. Implementation of the our Social Emotional Learning. This program will increase self awareness and will result in a more positive school atmosphere
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 20-21 school year we will reduce the overall number of referrals by 25%. To accomplish this, teachers will implement a restoration justice approach to classroom discipline.
Monitoring:	We will look at monthly trends of referrals and behaviors. We will have curriculum coaches work with our teachers to solidify their lesson. We will also focus on referrals given to students in differing subcategories to ensure proper teacher training if needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark McKinney (mark.mckinney@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Incentive Programs, PBIS point system which allows students to buy items form the school store. Social Emotional Learning training for students and teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Incentive Programs encourage positive behaviors by rewarding students for improved and appropriate behaviors. We will achieve this goal if we decrease referral rate by 25% from last year

Action Steps to Implement

1. Explain PBIS (Indian Bucks) to faculty and students.
2. Continue to create community partners to help assist with SChool based projects.t
3. Recognize students for positive behaviors.
4. Students and teachers are participating in SEL during Bison Mindsets to address overcoming obstacles and changing their mindset.

Person Responsible Mark McKinney (mark.mckinney@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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 schools data is not listed on the website. However, we will continue to focus on 5 areas other than faculty to student relationships.

- 1. Raising student expectations**
- 2. Increasing student engagement**
- 3. Showing Enthusiasm**
- 4. consistent opportunities for grade-appropriate assignments**
- 5. Providing Strong instructions**

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 will be using the Social and Emotional Learning/Character education (7 Mindsets) during Bison Mindset time everyday to meet the social-emotional needs of all students. Counseling and mentoring will be provided when needed. The community partnership schools group will also help provide students with resources outside of school to help with decision making and social emotional needs. We will recognize students of the week from all of the programs on campus.

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

Mr. McKinney sets the mission and vision for the school and the rest of the school faculty and staff help implement and reinforce his agenda for the school. Parental involvement in a child’s learning process from the early years to high school remains among the key factors contributing to a child’s success in school and life. It is widely associated with better learning outcomes, school improvement and lower risk of early school leaving and greater educational aspirations. Students will thrive in a safe and welcoming environment, foster mutual respect between students and staff while focusing on returning to their home school or preparing to enlist in the military, enroll in college or become gainfully employed.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00