

Holmes District School Board

Poplar Springs High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	25
Positive Culture & Environment	30
Budget to Support Goals	31

Poplar Springs High School

3726 ATOMIC DR, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://pshs.hdsb.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Laura Watford

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Holmes 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	25
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	31

Poplar Springs High School

3726 ATOMIC DR, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://pshs.hdsb.org/>

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-12	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	8%

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 Holmes 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.

At Poplar Springs High School we believe that a strong education foundation for students is essential to ensure that all students reach their full potential. We will provide a variety of learning strategies that will empower all students to be innovative thinkers, creative problem solvers, effective communicators and productive citizens. We will ensure that our staff is well-qualified and continues to develop the skills and competencies necessary to guarantee a safe and secure learning environment. We will maintain accountability each day to ensure success tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Poplar Springs High School that students will be innovative thinkers, creative problem solvers, effective communicators and productive citizens. All students will develop a strong foundation for continual learning.

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
West, Farica	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all campus activities.
Watford, Laura	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and campus level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities and services.
Simmons, Alice	School Counselor	Provides leadership in the school through the implementation of a comprehensive, data-driven school counseling program aligned with the district and school's mission to promote academic, social/emotional, and college/career development, while ensuring equity and access for all students.
Goodson, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	Facilitates and coordinates the services essential to the implementation of state and local student assessments, assists/coaches teachers in integrating formative assessment practices in schools and individual classrooms. This includes assisting teachers as they develop assessment items, analyze student work, and making instructional decisions based on the results of those assessments.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Laura Watford

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

1

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

390

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

2

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

3

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	34	28	21	26	17	25	51	24	30	44	40	32	18	390	
Attendance below 90 percent	16	16	14	13	7	10	15	8	7	18	7	5	9	145	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	2	4	8	3	9	8	7	9	3	59	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	7	10	2	8	7	6	4	1	54	
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	4	4	4	6	2	3	4	3	4	2	36

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	4	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

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	29	20	18	23	21	43	19	24	34	35	31	21	27	345
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	7	6	2	13	3	11	5	6	18	5	7	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	6	8	5	2	3	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3	6	3	2	4	26
	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	1	0	3	1	2	4	6	4	2	3	26

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	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	11
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	29	20	18	23	21	43	19	24	34	35	31	21	27	345	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	7	6	2	13	3	11	5	6	18	5	7	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	6	8	5	2	3	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3	6	3	2	4	26	
	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	1	0	3	1	2	4	6	4	2	3	26

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	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	
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				65%	53%	61%	59%	51%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	53%	59%	54%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	43%	54%	54%	43%	52%
Math Achievement				59%	53%	62%	57%	51%	61%
Math Learning Gains				63%	57%	59%	55%	50%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	47%	52%	43%	44%	52%
Science Achievement				60%	52%	56%	51%	50%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	72%	78%	84%	71%	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	68%	59%	9%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	52%	31%	56%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
06	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
07	2021					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
09	2021					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	55%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
10	2021					
	2019	57%	47%	10%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	60%	26%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	50%	16%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
06	2021					
	2019	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
07	2021					
	2019	70%	61%	9%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	35%	7%	46%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	48%	7%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	39%	41%	-2%	48%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	63%	19%	67%	15%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	76%	73%	3%	71%	5%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	36%	57%	-21%	70%	-34%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	48%	46%	2%	61%	-13%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	28%	32%	-4%	57%	-29%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

In 20-21, iReady progress monitoring data was used for grades K-8 and Achieve/Imagine Math for grades 9-12. In 21-22 we are shifting PM models to iReady K-5 and Edmentum for 6-12.

percent proficient/ percent approx 1 grade level behind/ percent approx 2 or more grade levels behind

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/94/6	56/38/6	71/29/0
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/82/18	0/94/6	38/63/0
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/47/41	32/58/11	47/53/0
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/71/24	26/68/5	68/32/0
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/24/38	45/32/23	48/26/26
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/52/43	18/68/14	30/57/13
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/25/30	50/40/10	50/36/14
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25/45/30	55/25/20	64/18/18
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34/32/34	39/34/27	60/27/13
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/69/13	25/59/16	62/33/4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			43
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59/29/12	35/47/18	50/35/15
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47/41/12	35/47/18	50/35/5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/17/38	63/13/25	60/28/12
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/61/9	31/38/31	36/44/20
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			70
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/33/39	29/29/43	41/27/32
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/31/69	22/41/38	0/45/55
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			37
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			52
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			15
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			52
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			48
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
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			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			64
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	20		21	40						
WHT	53	53	37	49	43	38	41	75	23	100	30
FRL	45	52	40	37	33	32	37	57	9	100	9

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	44	38		28	38						
WHT	66	59	45	60	64	55	62	69	53	63	67
FRL	60	53	31	50	58	48	54	54		59	60
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	40	67		29	38		18				
WHT	60	55	61	58	56	47	52	87	80	86	44
FRL	52	53	55	46	51	46	35	67		69	

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	49
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

In 20-21, grades 3, 5, and 8 reading was a concern. Algebra I and upper math is a concern based on FSA data. Science continues to be a challenge in meeting 50% proficiency benchmark across grade levels.

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

Using 2021 assessment data, 3rd grade reading and Algebra I proficiency are the areas in greatest need of improvement. 5th and 8th grade ELA scores have also been identified as in need of improvement due to below 50% proficiency.

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

In 3rd grade, the covid pandemic definitely played a role in disruption of instruction in a very crucial time of reading instruction paired with teacher illness and many student's missing days due to quarantine. We are a very small school, and the absence of our 3rd grade teacher every two to three weeks for a week at the time to seek medical treatment definitely played a role in student learning. Actions used to address these issues are change in instructional assignments in the 3rd/4th grade classrooms to include departmentalizing subjects with reading endorsed teachers in both classrooms. RTI time was also created in the 3rd/4th grade schedule with additional support provided throughout the day for small groups using a paraprofessional and Excel pullout for on or above grade level students for academic enrichment. We do have targeted support through JRF to support reading teachers as well as transitioning school wide to ELA BEST Standards.

In Algebra I, one of the contributing factors has been the number of teachers in upper math courses over the past few years. Some students have had as many as 6 teachers in three years. We have made a move to Alg 1A and 1B for 9th and 10 grade students to provide a better math foundation to students who historically have not scored proficient on FSA Math assessments. Students who are proficient on 7th grade Math FSA will continue to be enrolled in Algebra I in 8th grade.

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

High School ELA and Geometry showed improvement from 2019. Social Studies scores were also impressive.

PSHS met or exceeded the district and/or state average in most categories.

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

The major contributing factors to these improvements were student resilience and quality instruction.

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

Strategies to be used to accelerate learning include curriculum maps, intentional teaching, bell-to-bell instruction, standards based and data driven instruction, and appropriate use of the MTSS model.

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.

Teachers will be involved in revising curriculum maps through out the year as well as receiving training in BEST standards and progress monitoring tools. Support from JRF will be made available throughout the year to ensure the delivery of quality instruction as well as site based feedback from administration.

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

Excel groups in 3rd/4th grade is directly targeting on or above grade level students to accelerate them further as well as pull out remediation for math students in middle and high school. Based on available instructional units, these programs will be continued and possibly expanded.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based 2021 FSA data, PSHS is in need of improvement in reading proficiency in grades 3, 5, and 8 due to scores being below 50% of students scoring in the proficient range.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-22 school year, more than 50% of students in each grade level will score in the proficient range of reading using PM and state assessment data. Grade levels scoring above 50% in the 2020-21 school year will increase proficiency in reading by at least 2%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using 3 PM data points during the school year. Grades K-5 will also participate in monthly growth monitoring assessments. Administration and JRF will conduct routine walk-throughs to ensure the delivery of quality and standards based instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student feedback, small group instruction, instruction by reading endorsed teachers, interventions provided by reading endorsed teachers, ongoing professional development, and standards-based instruction are all strategies being implemented for this area of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale behind these strategies are based on state developed guidelines for effective reading instruction. Routine walk-throughs will be used to ensure their implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Highly qualified reading teachers in all ELA and Reading classrooms
2. Small group instruction for all students as a routine classroom practice
3. Data routinely monitored and used to assign students to intervention groups

Person Responsible Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

Based on 2021 state assessment data, Algebra I EOC proficiency is a critical need at PSHS.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Increase math proficiency for all grade levels by 5% to better prepare students to obtain a passing score on the Algebra I EOC.

Monitoring:

This area of Focus will be monitored through Progress Monitoring assessments three times a year. In addition, grades K-5 will take monthly growth monitoring assessments to guide instruction and remediation.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Students in grades K-5 will participate in small group instruction based on PM data and classroom performance. Students in grades 6+ will participate in math remediation classes during enrichment periods to address any math deficiencies. Students in grades 10-12 who have not passed the Algebra I EOC are enrolled in an intensive math course.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Based on the MTSS model, students receive math interventions in deficient areas to address learning gaps. Teachers will use iReady (K-5), Study Island (6-12), and curriculum based reteach resources to address student learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use data to create student rosters for math remediation.
2. Create math remediation time/courses in the master schedule.
3. Certified math teachers provide remedial instruction specific to individual student learning and intervention needs.

**Person
Responsible**

Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

Small group instruction and differentiation is a high yield strategy to increase student achievement and student engagement.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Students will demonstrate mastery of course standards as evidenced by improvements in their classroom daily grades following opportunities for learning via differentiation in the small group setting. By use of this strategy, the number of students failing individual courses should be reduced by 10% each grading period.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored via classroom walk-throughs, data meetings, and review of student progress.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Differentiation via small group instruction to increase student achievement and student engagement is the evidence based strategy being implemented for this area of focus.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to increase student achievement, increase student engagement, and reduce the number of students with failing course grades.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students to be placed in small groups for differentiation and instruction. All students are assigned to a group. Some groups may meet less frequently with teacher than other groups, based on individual needs.
2. Teachers create classroom instructional schedule to meet with small groups.
3. Teachers maintain documentation of who, when, what for small group instruction/rotation.
4. Review data in monthly meetings of impact on student learning and engagement.

Person**Responsible**

Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

1. Identify students to be placed in small groups for differentiation and instruction. All students are assigned to a group. Some groups may meet less frequently with teacher than other groups, based on individual needs.
2. Teachers create classroom instructional schedule to meet with small groups.
3. Teachers maintain documentation of who, when, what for small group instruction/rotation.
4. Review data in monthly meetings of impact on student learning and engagement.

Person**Responsible**

Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD subgroup was identified as a concern through 2019 state assessment data.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	Increase learning gains of SWD to at least 41%.
----------------------------	---

Monitoring:	Data for SWD will be monitored and discussed monthly in data meetings.
--------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Farica West (farica.west@hdsb.org)
---	------------------------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Other than 3 students, PSHS is a full inclusion school. SWD are provided support in the general education setting through ESE teacher and paraprofessionals.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion of SWD in the general education classroom with support is an evidence based strategy to increase achievement.
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Violent incidents- PSHS is ranked #96 out of 313 combination schools with an incident rate of 0.24 per 100 students. We had one incident of fighting last year that is ranked in this category.

Property incidents- PSHS is ranked #1 out of 313 combination schools with an incident rate of 0. This category includes burglary, theft, and vandalism.

Drug/public order incidents- PSHS ranked #261 out of 313 combination schools with an incident rate of .72 per 100 students. Our incidents involved the possession of tobacco on school campus.

Our combined incident rate is 1.0 out of 100 students which is below the state average of 1.6 incidents per 100 students in combination schools.

Total reported suspensions for the 2019-20 school year was 11.1 suspensions per 100 students for a total of 46 suspensions (days). Our county rank is 2 and statewide rank for combination schools is 264 out of 313.

During the 21-22 school year, we have the benefit of an on staff ISS and Timeout person available to assist with behavior interventions as well as an additional paraprofessional to assist in student supervision and classroom support. We are also in the process of reopening our SWAT (Students Working Against Tobacco) club in conjunction with Tobacco Free Holmes and the Florida Department of Health.

Our goal is to reduce suspensions and tobacco related incidents in the upcoming school year.

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.

PSHS builds a positive school culture by celebrating the diversity of our student body, staff, and community. While we are a small school, our students and community are represented by different races, ethnicity, religions, and socioeconomic groups. Stakeholder groups include local churches, businesses, agencies, and community organizations in addition to our students, families, and staff. Our administrative team has an

open door policy for the community, students, and staff and are daily on campus engaging our students and staff.

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

Alumni- support academic and athletic programs through the Booster Club

Volunteers- assist with preparing and planning school events and supporting the school vision

Local churches- support classrooms, teachers, and students with various supplies as well as supporting FCA

Local businesses- support the overall function of the school through volunteer hours, donated time, donated items, and sponsorships

Local agencies- provide support through informational programs as well as guidance in their area of expertise

Community members- support the vision and mission of the school by participating in school activities

Faculty/staff- supports the positive culture and environment of the school by creating an inviting and safe school atmosphere for students and stake holders

Students- support the positive culture and environment of the school by being prepared to learn and showing kindness to other students

Parents- support the positive culture and environment of the school by encouraging their student's academic success and daily attendance

PSHS- providing a quality, engaging academic experience for all students as well as a variety of enrichment, career, technical, and college prep courses and extracurricular activities

SAC- providing input and feedback on school wide practices, mission and vision

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00