Suwannee High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Suwannee High School

1314 PINE AVE SW, Live Oak, FL 32064

shs.suwannee.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Carl Manna

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 Suwannee 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

Suwannee High School

1314 PINE AVE SW, Live Oak, FL 32064

shs.suwannee.k12.fl.us

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	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	43%

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 Suwannee 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.

Suwannee High School will create and maintain a safe learning environment. We will solicit the support of community members to encourage positive relationships with parents and students to ensure the highest level of success for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Suwannee High School will work collaboratively to ensure that all students learn, meeting the academic standards set by the Florida Department of Education and the US Department of Education.

Suwannee County School District will be a system of excellence ensuring all students are prepared for personal success.

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
Manna, Carl	Principal	
Bius, Katrina	Assistant Principal	Graduation, CTE, Enrollment/Withdrawal, Attendance, ESOL, ESE
Caldwell, Gary	Assistant Principal	Administration, Facilities, Safety
Boggus, Tammy	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction
Hendry, Amy	Reading Coach	
Tuvell, Kimberly	Other	
Morgan, Stephen	Other	
Roberts, Melanie	Other	
Burt, Tamara	Other	
Aul, Nancy	Other	
Wiggins, Cindy	School Counselor	
Hall, Elisa	Other	
Thompson, Michelle	Other	
Green, Traci	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Carl Manna

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,156

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

12

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

12

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	347	301	274	224	1146
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	94	68	73	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	23	23	9	105
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	38	38	28	128
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	36	36	38	146
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	95	80	44	338
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	55	58	27	244
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	90	148	76	426

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	95	78	67	54	294

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	16	11	3	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	7	5	23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	319	334	262	245	1160
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	96	47	36	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	42	14	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	30	31	29	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	92	61	61	303
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	47	29	231
	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	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	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	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	73	92	69	43	277

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	5	9	3	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	10	10	35

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	319	334	262	245	1160
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	96	47	36	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	42	14	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	30	31	29	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	92	61	61	303
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	47	29	231
	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	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	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	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	73	92	69	43	277

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	5	9	3	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	10	10	35

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				50%	50%	56%	47%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	49%	51%	50%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	42%	42%	35%	35%	44%
Math Achievement				46%	46%	51%	39%	39%	51%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				43%	43%	48%	43%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	41%	45%	39%	39%	45%
Science Achievement				63%	63%	68%	68%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				63%	63%	73%	66%	66%	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	45%	47%	-2%	55%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	65%	66%	-1%	67%	-2%
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					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	68%	64%	4%	70%	-2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	22%	44%	-22%	61%	-39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	59%	59%	0%	57%	2%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 9
ELA - STAR, Adaptive Progress Monitoring
Algebra and Geometry - STAR
Grade 10
ELA - STAR, Adaptive Progress Monitoring
Algebra and Geometry - STAR
Biology - District Developed progress monitoring through Performance Matters
Grade 11
ELA Retakes - STAR
US History - District Developed progress monitoring through Performance Matters
Grade 12
ELA Retakes - STAR

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/34%	74/29%	89/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	4/11%	3/10%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	ALG [32/36%] GEO [86/91%]	ALG [35/33%] GEO [97/92%]	ALG [34/31%] GEO [102/94%]
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	ALG [4/22%] GEO [2/100%]	ALG [4/22%] GEO [2/100%]	ALG [4/18%] GEO [2/100%]
	English Language Learners	ALG [1/17%] GEO [1/100%]	ALG [2/25%] GEO [0/0%]	ALG [/1%14] GEO [0/0%]
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/62%	17/89%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/50%	0/0%	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	1/50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	
	English Language Learners	N/A	1/50%	

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	93/39%	100/38%	45/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/17%	2/6%	1/3%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	ALG [4/15%] GEO [50/66%]	ALG [7/23%] GEO [64/67%]	ALG [4/13%] GEO [66/69%]
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	ALG [1/20%] GEO [3/60%]	ALG [2/29%] GEO [2/29%]	ALG [0/0%] GEO [3/38%]
	English Language Learners	ALG [1/20%] GEO [1/33%]	ALG [1/17%] GEO [5/50%]	ALG [0/0%] GEO [0/0%]
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/39%	125/57%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/19%	5/17%	
	English Language Learners	1/17%	1/8%	
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/22%	17/57%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/19%	0/0%	1/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	0/0%	N/A
	English Language Learners	0/0%	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	ALG [1/50%] GEO [24/49%]	ALG [0/0%] GEO [24/41%]	ALG [1/50%] GEO [25/38%]
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	ALG [N/A%] GEO [2/22%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [1/9%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [2/17%]
	English Language Learners	ALG [0/0%] GEO [/2%67]	ALG [0%0] GEO [0/0%]	ALG [0/0%] GEO [2/50%]
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/50%	1/50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/24%	84/59%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	7/44%	
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/33%	

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/6%	0/0%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	ALG [0/0%] GEO [N/A%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [1/100%]	ALG [0/0%] GEO [0/0%]
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	ALG [N/A%] GEO [N/A%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [N/A%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [N/A%]
	English Language Learners	ALG [N/A/%] GEO [N/A%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [N/A%]	ALG [N/A%] GEO [N/A%]
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/50%	1/50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	0/0%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0/0%	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	

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	21	41	32	19	35	35	32	46		90	32
ELL	6	22	16	11	36	44	44	30		69	
BLK	25	45	43	17	26	33	43	44		93	46
HSP	36	40	22	23	37	36	65	70		90	62

| **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	31	27		25	29					83	60
WHT	54	54	38	42	36	49	71	85		96	80
FRL	36	42	34	25	33	34	56	60		94	65
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	17	29	38	15	28	29	19	25		100	30
ELL	10	35	40	26	60		20				
BLK	26	41	37	22	44	43	45	42		95	50
HSP	52	50	41	40	37	31	66	60		100	64
MUL	27	45		38				50			
WHT	56	51	44	54	44	40	69	73		98	76
FRL	38	45	43	36	37	43	49	57		98	67
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	19	34	22	17	31	33	33	18		75	15
ELL	10	36	25	13	31						
BLK	24	35	22	27	32	24	45	47		94	53
HSP	42	54	48	38	44	47	61	52		100	63
MUL	38	69									
WHT	56	53	39	45	49	50	80	77		93	72
FRL	42	48	34	35	38	36	63	63		96	58

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	53
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	583
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	48
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	43
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	61
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	48
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?

Suwannee High School decreased in all areas of ELA and Math proficiency and growth as compared to the 18-19 school data. It is interesting to note that in the areas of 9th grade ELA and Algebra EOC proficiency, when compared to state average, the gap decreased from 2018-2019 meaning that although our scores decreased, they were closer to state average.

In the areas of Biology and US History, the percent of students scoring proficient increased from 63% to 64% and from 63% to 74% respectively from the 18-19 to 20-21 and was, in both areas, above state average.

The ESSA subgroups SWD and ELL continue to score below 41%.

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

Based on 2020-2021 data, the data component showing the lowest performance is Math Proficiency. The percent of students scoring proficient on the FSA Geometry EOC was 42%, down 17% from 59% for the 18-19 school year and a 6% gap when compared to state average. The percent of students scoring proficient on the FSA Algebra EOC was 14%, down 8% from 22% for the 18-19 school year and an 8% gap when compared to state average.

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

Moving from a 7 period day to a 6 period day resulted in a reduction in the number of math supports. Removing the extra period eliminated the time to provide Intensive Math and an operating after school Math Lab. The lack of data to place math students caused inconsistencies in the scheduling of math placements. In addition, there was not data to base instruction and determine specific learning gaps. Students had learning gaps from the prior year instruction and absenteeism was high. New actions needed to address this need for improvement include progress monitoring data and analysis of standardized testing data that allow more precise scheduling based on students needs. In addition, the creation of an attendance campaign will improve attendance and allow for more consistent instruction.

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

Based on progress monitoring data and 2018-2019 state assessment data, 74% of students scored proficient on the US History NGSS EOC for an increase of 9% from 63% in 2020-21 for a 9% and 11% over the 2020-21 state average of 63%.

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

Teachers focused on a better understanding and more in-depth coverage of standards and related vocabulary.

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

1. Reorganization of the ELA and Reading department so that teachers will provide small group, face to face tier 3 intervention to their own ELA students in the 9th and 10th grades.
2. Addition of resources as a result of new textbook adoption allows for instruction with multiple learning styles at varying levels.
3. Addition of a reading/instructional coach which provides data and specific targeted intervention for students struggling in reading.
4. Intervention rotations for intensive reading.
5. Collaboration of teachers during common planning and Professional Learning Communities days.
6. Teacher initiated bootcamps offering after school tutoring for closing gaps in learning.
7. Before and after school study help sessions for ESE and ELL.
8. A focus on closing learning gaps for our most struggling readers to include Maze testing, the Rewards Program, and Elevate to support the 5 areas of fluency, vocabulary, phonics, comprehension, and phonemic awareness.

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.

Professional Development for teachers on Research-based strategies.
Professional Development to improve Tier 1 instruction.
Professional Development and support for the implementation of B.E.S.T standards in ELA and math.

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

Ongoing monitoring of student data and student progress.
Programs to support intervention rotations.
Support for any after school Bootcamps.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-21 FSA ELA data, students scored 44% in the area of ELA Achievement. This is a significant decrease in the area of ELA Achievement at Suwannee High School that has been trending upward since at least 2016. This area of focus correlates with Goal 1 of the Suwannee County School District Strategic Plan promoting academic achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, 49% of the students will score proficient on the FSA/ELA. This is an increase of 5% from the 2020-2021 school year.
Monitoring:	Star Progress monitoring and standardized testing data analysis. Classroom level formative and summative assessments. Informal teacher assessment. Administrative walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group, face-to-face instruction Graphic Organizers/concept mapping/nonlinguistic representation Higher order questioning Response to intervention Scaffolding Interventions for students with learning needs Deliberate practice Explicit and systematic phonics Instruction Multiple exposure to material Application of content Standard aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In response to the state expectations for reading and implementation of the District reading plan, our district provided the opportunity to have a reading/ instructional coach allowing us to support reading intervention. District provided new textbooks with online resources for support of new ELA standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Reorganization of the ELA and Reading department that allows teachers to teach their own students in both ELA and Intensive Reading. Teachers will provide small group, face to face tier 3 intervention to their own ELA students in the 9th and 10th grades, through a rotation format.

Person Responsible Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

A focus on closing learning gaps for our most struggling readers through programs to include Maze testing, the Rewards Program, and Elevate (reading horizons) to support areas of fluency, vocabulary, phonics, and phonemic awareness.

Person Responsible Amy Hendry (amy.hendry@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Addition of a reading/instructional coach which provides data and specific targeted intervention to the most struggling student.

Person Responsible Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Collaboration of teachers during common planning and Professional Learning Communities day.

Person Responsible   Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Addition of resources as a result of B.E.S.T standards and new textbook adoption allows for instruction with multiple learning styles at varying levels.

Person Responsible   Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Teacher initiated bootcamps offering after school tutoring for closing gaps in learning.

Person Responsible   Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Algebra and Geometry are both critical need areas based on the 2020-21 FSA data. Only 14% of students who took the Algebra EOC scored proficient. This in itself is concerning. 42% of the students taking the Geometry EOC scored proficient which reflect a 17% decrease from 2018-19. This area of focus correlates with Goal 1 of the Suwannee County School District Strategic Plan promoting academic achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, 37% of the students will score proficient on the Algebra and Geometry EOC. This is an increase of 5% from the 2020-2021 school year.
Monitoring:	Star Progress monitoring and standardized testing data analysis with provide data on student instructional and intervention needs. Classroom level formative and summative assessments. Formal and Informal teacher assessments. Administrative walkthroughs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group, face-to-face instruction Graphic Organizers/concept mapping/nonlinguistic representation Higher order questioning Response to intervention Scaffolding Interventions for students with learning needs Deliberate practice Multiple exposure to material Application of content Standard aligned instruction Help students recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A focus on high quality tier 1 instruction and on fundamental skills for struggling students will support success for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement	
Intervention rotations for tier 3 math using small group, face to face interventions.	
Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Weekly team meetings/professional development with district math coach to support for intervention, standard aligned instruction, student engagement, and implementation of B.E.S.T standards.	
Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Exploration into online support for implementation in intervention rotations.	
Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Improving general classroom instruction through conceptual math instruction.	
Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Collaboration of teachers during common planning and Professional Learning Communities day	

| **Person Responsible** | Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us) |

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Students With Disabilities subgroup scored 33% which is below 41% on the Federal Index in the 2018-2019 school year. Specifically, the Students With Disabilities subgroup scored 17% proficient in the area of ELA Achievement and 15% proficient in the area of Mathematics Achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, Students with Disabilities will increase percent proficient on the FSA/ELA and FSA/Algebra or Geometry by 5% from the 2018-2019 school year.
Monitoring:	Star Progress monitoring and standardized testing data analysis will provide data on student instructional and intervention needs. Classroom level formative and summative assessments. Formal and Informal teacher assessments. Administrative walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Thompson (michelle.thompson@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group, face-to-face instruction Response to intervention Scaffolding Interventions for students with learning needs Deliberate practice Multiple exposure to material Application of content
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the data, our SWD subgroup may need more academic support than can be provided in 1 class period. Students will have the opportunity for small group and one-on-one instruction and support.

Action Steps to Implement

Continuation of Peers As Partners in Learning program and curriculum to support SWD within the classroom. More deliberate collection of data to document student growth and success.

| **Person Responsible** | Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us) |

Open resource room for students before and after school providing homework support, tutoring, and one-on-one instruction for students with disabilities.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Thompson (michelle.thompson@suwannee.k12.fl.us) |

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Language Learners subgroup scored 32% which is below 41% on the Federal Index in the 2018-2019 school year. Specifically, the English Language Learners subgroup scored 10% proficient in the area of ELA Achievement and 26% proficient in the area of Mathematics Achievement. Results from Star Progress monitoring showed that the English Language Learner subgroup scored significantly low in all areas.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, English Language Learners will increase percent proficient on the FSA/ELA and FSA/Algebra or Geometry by 5% from the 2018-2019 school year.
Monitoring:	Star Progress monitoring and standardized testing data analysis will provide data on student instructional and intervention needs. Classroom level formative and summative assessments. Formal and Informal teacher assessments. Administrative walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Bius (katrina.walker-bius@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group, face-to-face instruction Response to intervention Scaffolding Interventions for students with learning needs Deliberate practice Multiple exposure to material Application of content
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	More targeted monitoring will ensure that students who need support will get it in a timely manner. We believe that before school tutoring will provide specific instruction and help support gaps and be in alignment with school transportation.

Action Steps to Implement

English Language Learners will be supported through Spanish Speaks course.

Person Responsible	Katrina Bius (katrina.walker-bius@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Students will be provided before school tutoring based on their ability using Reading Horizons.

Person Responsible	Katrina Bius (katrina.walker-bius@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

ELL para support and professional development in Reading Horizons.

Person Responsible	Katrina Bius (katrina.walker-bius@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring of grades, attendance, referrals and progress monitoring data, by administration.

Person Responsible	Katrina Bius (katrina.walker-bius@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Multi-Racial subgroup scored 40% which is below 41% on the Federal Index in the 2018-2019 school year. Specifically, the Multi-Racial subgroup scored 27% proficient in the area of ELA Achievement and 38% proficient in the area of Mathematics Achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, Multi-Racial subgroup will increase percent proficient on the FSA/ELA and FSA/Algebra or Geometry by 5% from the 2018-2019 school year.
Monitoring:	Star Progress monitoring and standardized testing data analysis will provide data on student instructional and intervention needs. Classroom level formative and summative assessments. Formal and Informal teacher assessments. Administrative walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy will encourage teachers to produce the desired outcome. Student self grading
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By identifying this subgroup, teachers can provide the support these students need to be successful

Action Steps to Implement

To improve student success of this subgroup through the identification, monitoring, and support.

Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Data Chats to monitor success

Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Best practices to support student strengths and weaknesses.

Person Responsible	Tammy Boggus (tamara.boggus@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Suwannee High School currently has 294 students with 2 or more indicators and 33 students with 4 or more indicators on the Early Warning system (EWS).
Measurable Outcome:	Students at Suwannee High School will maintain or decrease the number of EWS indicators that place them at risk.
Monitoring:	EWS reports will be analyzed after each progress report and report card period to monitor students with 4 or more indicators.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carl Manna (carl.manna@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Mentoring and relationship building Assigning adult advocates to students at rick of dropping out.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will have an advocate who can support by addressing academic, social and emotions needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Students on the First 20 Days Early Warning System Report will be assigned an administrative mentor to monitor and oversee progress and build a relationship with the students.

Person Responsible	Carl Manna (carl.manna@suwannee.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.

Suwannee High School is ranked 323 our of 505 high schools statewide school incident ranking. Our primary area of concern is violent incidents where we are ranked 345 out of 505. We believe that this is a result of our data reporting process. In the future, data reporting will follow new procedures that will put us inline with the actual data. Monitoring will occur by the Dean and Discipline PLC who will generate monthly referral reports. In addition, we have implemented a positive reward system where student are identified for outstanding behavior and academic performance through a weekly incentive program.

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.

Suwannee High School builds a positive school culture by building relationships with students. Administration is visible and present in all aspects of academic and extracurricular activities. We have implemented a positive reward system where student are identified for outstanding behavior and academic performance through a weekly incentive program.

Suwannee High School also builds a positive school culture and environment through clear communication. Suwannee High School provides and updates a wide range of information through a variety of social media platforms including SHS website, SHS Facebook page, Remind, Canvas. In addition, we provide a weekly Robo call out.

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

Stakeholder relationship building will take place through our Suwannee High Advisory Committee (SHAC). This committee allows all stakeholders the opportunity to engage in the various processes of the school. Further, the SHAC aides in showcasing student works and achievements. Through SHAC, the school is also able to provide needed assistance to students and parents with events related to Financial Aid, NCAA Clearinghouse, etc.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00

Total:	$0.00