Alachua County Public Schools

Hawthorne Middle/High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hawthorne Middle/High School

21403 SE 69TH AVE, Hawthorne, FL 32640

https://www.sbac.edu/hawthorne

Demographics

Principal: John Green

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: D (37%)
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 Alachua 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

Hawthorne Middle/High School

21403 SE 69TH AVE, Hawthorne, FL 32640

https://www.sbac.edu/hawthorne

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 6-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Hawthorne Middle/High School Faculty and Staff strive to provide quality instruction and opportunities for the academic, personal, social, and vocational development of our students in a clean, safe and healthy environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are committed to the success of every student. We want all students to be college and career ready.

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
Beverly, Judy	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach & Department Chair
Ferguson, Daniel	Principal	Instructional Leader
Doll, Karen	School Counselor	School counseling and college / career coach.
Johnson, Cheryl	Teacher, Career/ Technical	FCIMS Facilitator
Leggon, Petrina	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for AVID
McLeod, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Assist school principal with curriculum, administration and student services.
Daniels, Cedderick	Dean	Assist principal with school discipline and school wide positive behavior programs.
HIcks, Ben	Math Coach	Math Coach and department Chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/19/2017, John Green

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

475

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

0

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

4

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	66	61	85	84	73	50	56	475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	14	23	20	22	15	19	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	1	1	2	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	7	3	1	1	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	7	6	2	2	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	18	29	18	14	19	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	30	16	27	14	13	23	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	18	29	18	14	19	126

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	12	21	17	22	16	13	17	118

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	2	2	3	3	5	3	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/13/2021

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	53	77	67	52	53	52	46	400
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	19	19	18	19	18	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3	1	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	21	19	17	13	16	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	18	18	14	11	0	0	90

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	15	11	11	10	10	16	11	84

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	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	77	67	52	53	52	46	400
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	19	19	18	19	18	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3	1	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	21	19	17	13	16	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	18	18	14	11	0	0	90

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	15	11	11	10	10	16	11	84

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	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	6
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				41%	59%	56%	41%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				38%	52%	51%	60%	55%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	39%	42%	53%	41%	44%
Math Achievement				42%	54%	51%	40%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				44%	54%	48%	55%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	48%	45%	53%	37%	45%
Science Achievement				39%	68%	68%	36%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				64%	75%	73%	53%	73%	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**
06	2021					
	2019	21%	53%	-32%	54%	-33%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	61%	-19%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
09	2021					
	2019	51%	60%	-9%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
10	2021					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2021					
	2019	35%	52%	-17%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	49%	59%	-10%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	27%	15%	46%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	43%	66%	-23%	67%	-24%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	55%	69%	-14%	71%	-16%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	74%	71%	3%	70%	4%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	27%	56%	-29%	61%	-34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	30%	48%	-18%	57%	-27%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

AIMS Progress Monitoring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53.4	51.9	56.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.7	50.2	51.9
	Students With Disabilities	47.5	47.1	53.6
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	48	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	41	53
	Students With Disabilities	28	36	51
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48.7	47.9	50.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.0	48.6	51.4
	Students With Disabilities	28.1	38.1	31.0
	English Language Learners	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49	37	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	36	41
	Students With Disabilities	33	40	24
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	39.1	34.8	35.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.8	36.1	34.4
	Students With Disabilities	42.2	28.6	30.5
	English Language Learners		36.0	33.3

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.7	37.9	49.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.9	35.2	49.0
	Students With Disabilities	37.1	32.1	40.0
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	41	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	41	46
	Students With Disabilities	41	36	55
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40	32.6	34.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.1	31.5	33.8
	Students With Disabilities	34.2	29.2	33.5
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53.6	34.3	47.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.5	33.9	47.9
	Students With Disabilities	43.9	28.1	53.1
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56.3	38.4	33.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.5	36.4	34.0
	Students With Disabilities	51.1	28.9	32.0
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	64.9	54.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.7	64.5	51.7
	Students With Disabilities	54.7	75.0	60.0
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43.5	46.5	41.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.1	45.3	44.1
	Students With Disabilities	33.3	40.0	38.9
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	46.0	39.7	50.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.8	39.5	48.4
	Students With Disabilities	39.9	36.3	44.8
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students 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	9	25	22	4	24	20	13	15			
BLK	16	37	29	10	22	18	12	33	50	94	47
HSP	27			10	10						
MUL	26	43		30	36			17			
WHT	38	44	29	39	35	27	27	38	47	95	21

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
FRL	25	39	32	25	27	20	14	29	50	93	37

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	26	46	45	17	32	25	38	41			
BLK	33	42	40	26	31	27	40	47		100	20
HSP	45			60							
MUL	60	70		55							
WHT	43	29	29	52	55	42	36	72		93	44
FRL	36	34	31	36	38	22	38	61		89	24

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	21	50	44	22	29		21	42			
BLK	27	48	50	23	52	54	18	39		65	27
HSP	31	54									
MUL	60	70									
WHT	50	66	55	48	56		45	62	50	89	47
FRL	42	60	53	34	51	53	37	55	69	73	32

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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 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	33
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	16
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
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?

Students struggled across all grade levels, subgroups and core content areas

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

All areas need improvement due to the impact the COVID pandemic on the community. The ones that showed the greatest need for improvement are Civics and 7th grade math

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

All areas need improvement due to the impact the COVID pandemic on the community. Actions that can help improve this year is more robust tutoring and boot camps

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

6th grade math and 6th grade ELA

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

We offered tutoring through Zoom and in-person tutoring

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

more robust tutoring and boot camps

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 will be centered around creating more rigor in the classroom, building relational capacity, and best teaching practices. Examples of these are higher order thinking skills, higher order questions, critical thinking, high-impact writing, and active reading.

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

more training in AP courses, offering more AP/AICE classes. We will continue tutoring and boot camps to strengthen skills

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Current level of performance is 42%, as evidenced in 2018-2019 FSA & EOCs. We expect our performance level to be 47% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The problem/achievement gap is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the math proficiency level when entering these courses.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving Math FSA ,algebra 1 and geometry EOC proficiency will increase from 42% to 47%, as measured by FSA, algebra 1 and geometry EOCs.
Monitoring:	Math team will meet bi-monthly to review progress and collaborate with math coach.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ben HIcks (hicksbe@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development geared to strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Increase teacher capacity in the use of flexible instructional strategies that help students demonstrate what they know, what they have learned, and how they engage in their learning. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Best Standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The specific strategies were selected to assist teachers by helping them maximize their instructional impact. The criteria used to make this determination is our FSA EOC results, cycle data, and input from our mathematics department.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common planning for Algebra 1, and geometry teachers for the purpose of developing common lesson plans and assessments which are aligned to the district pacing guides and provide rigorous standards-based instruction.
2. Algebra and Geometry teachers will utilize district provided supplemental materials and resources such as SAT practice guides to develop problems and formative assessment skills practice and remediation.
3. Increase fidelity and routine use of all levels of the Focused Note-taking process in all math classes.
4. Math teachers will be provided pre-existing resources for student growth and proficiency. Students will receive reward and recognition for using online platforms (IXL and Khan Academy) that assist in practicing math skills.
5. Teachers will utilize Illuminate and other platforms to support assessment and growth.
6. Teachers will conduct data chats in PLC's, classrooms, and teacher-student conferences to determine what interventions, strategies, and supports are necessary to address student needs and increase their proficiency through re-teaching opportunities and differentiated independent practice.

Person Responsible	Daniel Ferguson (fergusd@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Current level of ELA performance is 41%, as evidenced in 2018-2019 FSA & EOCs. We expect our performance level to be 47% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The problem/achievement gap is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the ELA proficiency level when entering these courses.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving ELA FSA proficiency will increase from 41% to 47%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	ELA team will meet bi-monthly to review progress and collaborate with ELA coach.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Beverly (beverljm@sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development geared to strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Increase teacher capacity in the use of flexible instructional strategies that helps students demonstrate what they know, what they have learned, and how they engage in their learning. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Best Standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The specific strategies were selected to assist teachers by helping them maximize their instructional impact. The criteria used to make this determination is our FSA results, cycle data, and input from our Language Art and Cross Curriculum departments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common planning for English Language Arts (ELA) teachers for
the purpose of developing common lesson plans and assessments which are aligned to the district pacing guides and provide rigorous standards-based instruction.
2.ELA teachers will utilize district provided supplemental materials and
resources such as science practice guides to develop problems and formative assessment skills practice and remediation.
3. Increase fidelity and routine use of all levels of the Focused Note-taking process in all ELA classes.
4. ELA teachers will be provided pre-existing resources for student growth and proficiency. Students will receive reward and recognition for using online platforms (USA Test Prep & IXL) that assist in practicing science skills.
5. Teachers will utilize Illuminate and other platforms to support assessment and
growth.
6. Teachers will conduct data chats in PLC's, classrooms, and teacher-student conferences to determine what interventions, strategies, and supports are necessary to address student needs and increase their proficiency through re-teaching opportunities and differentiated independent practice.

Person Responsible	Lisa McLeod (mcleodlm@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Current level of science performance is 39%, as evidenced in 2018-2019 FSA & EOCs. We expect our performance level to be 45% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The problem/achievement gap is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the science proficiency level when entering these courses.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving Science NGSSS EOC proficiency will increase from 39% to 45%, as measured by NGSSS EOCs for 8th grade and Biology.
Monitoring:	Science team will meet bi-monthly to review progress and collaborate with science department chair.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	May Steward (stewarms@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development geared to strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Increase teacher capacity in the use of flexible instructional strategies that help students demonstrate what they know, what they have learned, and how they engage in their learning. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Best Standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The specific strategies were selected to assist teachers by helping them maximize their instructional impact. The criteria used to make this determination is our EOC results, cycle data, and input from our science department.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common planning for Biology and 8th Grade Science teachers for the purpose of developing common lesson plans and assessments which are aligned to the district pacing guides and provide rigorous standards-based instruction.
2. Biology and 8th Grade Science teachers will utilize district provided supplemental materials and resources such as science practice guides to develop problems and formative assessment skills practice and remediation.
3. Increase fidelity and routine use of all levels of the Focused Note-taking process in all science classes.
4. Science teachers will be provided pre-existing resources for student growth and proficiency. Students will receive reward and recognition for using online platforms (USA Test Prep & IXL) that assist in practicing science skills.
5. Teachers will utilize Illuminate and other platforms to support assessment and growth.
6. Teachers will conduct data chats in PLC's, classrooms, and teacher-student conferences to determine what interventions, strategies, and supports are necessary to address student needs and increase their proficiency through re-teaching opportunities and differentiated independent practice.

Person Responsible Lisa McLeod (mcleodlm@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Current level of performance is 64%, as evidenced in 2018-2019 FSA & EOCs. We expect our performance level to be 70% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The problem/achievement gap is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the math proficiency level when entering these courses.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving Social Studies EOC proficiency will increase from 64% to 70%, as measured by Civics and US History EOCs.
Monitoring:	Social Science team will meet bi-monthly to review progress and collaborate with department chair.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annette Verschaeve (verschal@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development geared to strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Increase teacher capacity in the use of flexible instructional strategies that help students demonstrate what they know, what they have learned, and how they engage in their learning. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Best Standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The specific strategies were selected to assist teachers by helping them maximize their instructional impact. The criteria used to make this determination is our Civics and US History EOC results, cycle data, and input from our social science department.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common planning for social science teachers for the purpose of developing common lesson plans and assessments which are aligned to the district pacing guides and provide rigorous standards-based instruction.
2.Social Science teachers will utilize district provided supplemental materials and resources such as science practice guides to develop problems and formative assessment skills practice and remediation.
3. Increase fidelity and routine use of all levels of the Focused Note-taking process in all social science classes.
4. Social science teachers will be provided pre-existing resources for student growth and proficiency. Students will receive reward and recognition for using online platforms (USA Test Prep & IXL) that assist in practicing science skills.
5. Teachers will utilize Illuminate and other platforms to support assessment and growth.
6. Teachers will conduct data chats in PLC's, classrooms, and teacher-student conferences to determine what interventions, strategies, and supports are necessary to address student needs and increase their proficiency through re-teaching opportunities and differentiated independent practice.

Person Responsible	Annette Verschaeve (verschal@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The subgroup of Students with Disabilities achieved an ESSA federal index rating of 34%, below the overall school rating of 48% This is our only ESSA subgroup to perform below the target of at least 41%
Measurable Outcome:	We will improve the academic performance of students with disabilities to meet or exceed the target ESSA subgroup federal index rating of 41%
Monitoring:	ESE team will meet bi-monthly to review progress and collaborate with math and ELA coaches.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa McLeod (mcleodlm@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math coaches will concentrate time with intensive Math teachers in 6-10th grade. The implementation of IXL, Khan Academy, and EDI will also help teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The specific strategies were selected to assist teachers by helping them maximize their instructional impact. The criteria used to make this determination is our FSA EOC results, cycle data, and input from our mathematics department.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Case managers and counselors work together to assist students with graduation requirement checks and supports.
2. ESE teachers will assist students with literacy skills, math skills, organizational skills, and note taking strategies during learning strategies courses.
3. Collaboration embedded into core subject areas to support ESE students.
4. Ensure common planning for specially designed and standards based instruction in core content areas.
5. Ensure all collaborative teacher teams attend professional development.
6. Use support facilitation/collaborative model for the full class period.
7. Embed reading skills support into ninth grade learning strategies classes.

Person Responsible	Karen Doll (dollk@gm.sbac.edu)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2020-2021 school year, 14% of our students missed more than 10% of the school year. We expect this percentage to drop to less than 10% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because students who are at-risk for attendance may not be fully engaged in school. If better instructional engagement would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies weekly through our MTSS team.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 14% to at less than 5%, as measured by attendance data.
Monitoring:	Attendance will be monitored daily by the Dean.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cedderick Daniels (danielcl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students with attendance issues with an Attendance Success Plan.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies are needed to assist students by decreasing the percentage of students who miss more than 10% of the school year. The criteria used to make this determination is our attendance rate from 20-21.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff.
2. Map the attendance resources, interventions and incentives at our school to support increased attendance for each Tier.
3. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance.
4. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions.
5. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a reoccurring basis.

Person Responsible	Cedderick Daniels (danielcl@gm.sbac.edu)

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.

N/A

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 on building a school culture that constructs a philosophical environment and a physical environment that support the academic and emotional wellbeing of all students. Furthermore, the school culture cultivates safety, learning from mistakes, and academic risk-taking in order to accelerate language and literacy development.

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

AVID team members are responsible for promoting and facilitating a positive culture and environment at the school. All employees share a role in this effort.

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
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$275,266.00