Broward County Public Schools

Piper High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Piper High School

8000 NW 44TH ST, Lauderhill, FL 33351

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marie Hautigan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
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 Broward 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

Piper High School

8000 NW 44TH ST, Lauderhill, FL 33351

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

"We, the Piper High School Community, recognize the needs of our diverse population and are committed to ensure that all students receive an outstanding education, within a safe and secure environment."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Hautigan , Marie	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Kothe, Patrick	Assistant Principal	The role of an assistant principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Boyett, Jamie	Teacher, ESE	Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialists are responsible for providing support to schools to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems.
Schuck, Jacqueline	Administrative Support	The ESOL Coordinator is responsible for planning and administering the district ESOL program and all state reporting.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/1/2019, Marie Hautigan

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.*
21

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.*
80

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
103

Total number of students enrolled at the school
2,215

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.
2

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	635	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569	0	0	569
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552	0	552
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552	552
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	62	108	88	345
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	143	124	139	598
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	156	110	200	672
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

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	265	211	175	190	841

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	12	15	40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/28/2021

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	608	533	533	538	2212
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	72	79	105	382
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	58	150	125	333
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	90	75	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	146	125	46	506
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	142	0	0	344

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	140	160	120	85	505

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	49	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	28	34	21	109

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	608	533	533	538	2212
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	72	79	105	382
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	58	150	125	333
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	90	75	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	146	125	46	506
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	142	0	0	344

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	140	160	120	85	505

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	49	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	28	34	21	109

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				38%	57%	56%	37%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	52%	51%	45%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	45%	42%	37%	47%	44%
Math Achievement				29%	51%	51%	28%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				35%	44%	48%	35%	45%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	43%	45%	29%	46%	45%
Science Achievement				54%	66%	68%	53%	64%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				53%	71%	73%	54%	70%	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	42%	57%	-15%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	31%	53%	-22%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	54%	67%	-13%	67%	-13%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	52%	67%	-15%	70%	-18%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	25%	61%	-36%	61%	-36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	56%	-25%	57%	-26%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Formative Assessments, FSA and EOC Results

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	30	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	28	31
	Students With Disabilities	15	15	17
	English Language Learners	0	4	4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	12	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	12	12
	Students With Disabilities	12	12	15
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	42	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	40	50
	Students With Disabilities	20	38	50
	English Language Learners	10	25	33
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	30	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	29	32
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	13
	English Language Learners	0	4	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	10	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	9	10
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	7
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	21	24	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	24	30
	Students With Disabilities	16	22	25
	English Language Learners	14	18	21
	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

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	39	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	38	48
	Students With Disabilities	5	12	20
	English Language Learners	4	11	15

Grade 12				
	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
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	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	20	32	24	13	19	26	31	31		100	20
ELL	16	47	43	8	21	35	29	27		100	65
ASN	45	40		7				60		100	85
BLK	32	35	29	10	16	29	38	49		98	41
HSP	40	46	45	17	15	24	44	55		99	56

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	57	42		25	10			80		95	44
WHT	49	61	60	19	22		68	85		89	63
FRL	31	36	32	10	17	33	37	46		98	43

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	23	40	33	21	29	13	32	33		94	21
ELL	14	46	51	17	32	33	32	33		84	55
ASN	56	53		36	33			80		100	71
BLK	33	50	41	26	33	29	51	48		95	43
HSP	46	55	64	34	42	33	57	65		94	55
MUL	72	65			29	14		67	56	100	69
WHT	49	47	27	49	46			60	64	96	60
FRL	35	49	44	26	32	27	51	48		95	47

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	15	31	21	19	43	36	21	36		76	27
ELL	11	35	32	16	22	23	40	22		81	62
ASN	50	47		45				65		94	69
BLK	31	44	37	24	33	29	48	45		90	45
HSP	47	46	32	40	43	22	58	71		90	63
MUL	59	63		42	25		73	92		100	64
WHT	53	50	40	39	42	40	81	76		89	62
FRL	34	44	37	27	35	28	48	50		88	49

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	40
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	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	84%
Subgroup Data	

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

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	48
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
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	44
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	50
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	57
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	38
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?

We continue to see significant gaps between our SWDs and Non-SWD populations across ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies.

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

Mathematics proficiency demonstrated a significant drop as a result of remote learning.

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

The pandemic and remote learning adversely affected instruction across all classrooms, and assessment data suggests these effects were particularly pronounced in mathematics. Teachers across disciplines worked tirelessly over the summer and through professional development to modify curriculum and improve formative assessments to meet these challenges.

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

U.S. History showed the most improvement considering the adverse affects of remote learning.

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

The US History team is significantly aligned on curriculum and were at the forefront of technological innovation during remote learning.

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

Targeted remediation for pronounced learning gaps through sensitive pacing and small-group pullouts is needed across areas.

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.

Faculty and administration have already been working in concert to address these issues through regular PLC meetings, schoolwide professional development, and outside support.

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

The addition of intervention support in ELA and Math for small-group remediation has occured.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math achievement was the lowest component area in the school.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement on the 2022 Algebra and Geometry exams will increase by 5%.
Monitoring:	PLCs will meet to design common formative assessments, analyze shared data, align instruction, and share best practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marie Hautigan (marie.hautigan@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Data Analysis and Problem-Solving
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that regular formative assessments and collaborative data analysis improves instruction and student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Despite improvements in ELA achievement, more than half of students continue to struggle with grade-level reading comprehension.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to have a 5% increase in student performance on the FSA reading and writing assessment.
Monitoring:	Piper will address school wide literacy through a series of evidence-based strategies, including aligned curriculum and formative assessments, data collection and analysis through PLC collaboration, school-wide professional development focused on improving student engagement through literacy, and cross-curricular literacy professional development in social studies and science. Supplemental literacy support includes the use of targeted digital platforms (Achieve 3000, USA Test Prep).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patrick Kothe (patrick.kothe@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Data Analysis & Problem-Solving; Cross-Content Literacy; Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that collaborative PLCs focused on curricular alignment, data collection through formative assessments, and regular analysis of student performance improves student achievement, particularly with struggling students. Additionally, school wide professional development that focuses on the sharing of best practices to engage students through literacy increases student performance across curricular areas. For struggling readers to grow, they must interact with complex texts across the school day; for this to occur, teachers in non-literacy areas must participate in professional development to align instructional capacity with the needs of the students

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

We will continue to implement our schoolwide positive behavior plan which has resulted in fewer referrals and suspensions over the last 2 years.

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.

The school focuses significantly on building a positive, supportive culture on campus and throughout the community. By focusing on community outreach, we have significantly increased participation in SAC/SAF/PSAT, leading to greater community involvement. We have promoted a schoolwide non-violence program developed and implemented by upperclassmen and have seen a significant drop in on-campus violence (in the months before the outbreak). We have included the city mayor and city commission in many of our school improvement projects and community outreach events.

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

The principal works as the leader of the school community to communicate schoolwide initiatives and goals. The leadership team comprised of principals, teachers, and support staff meet regularly to discuss improvements to school culture. The SAC committee comprised of important community stakeholders meets regularly with school leaders to address school issues and promote a positive environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**