

Broward County Public Schools

J. P. Taravella High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

J. P. Taravella High School

10600 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marietta De Armas

Start Date for this Principal: 10/13/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 69% |
| 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 (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) |
| 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 | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

J. P. Taravella High School

10600 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[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 | 54% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 80% |

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.

Building relationships to make lasting impressions while motivating, educating, and graduating our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare 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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| De Armas, Marietta | Principal | <p>The goal of my position as principal is to provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment. My leadership role can be categorized as: Instructional Leadership, Organizational Leadership, and ensuring Professional and Ethical Leadership.</p> <p>As the principal I am responsible for knowledge, skills and abilities to: provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school; prepare and manage the school's budget and manage and inventory the school's assets; to read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws; use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures; enforce collective bargaining agreements; use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem solving skills; maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues; perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization; communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through use of technology; and analyze and use data. I consistently check for current educational trends and research. Knowledge and understanding of the unique needs and characteristics of school system.</p> |
| Crossman, Christopher | Assistant Principal | Monitor, supervise and mentor teachers in the Mathematics, ESE, Guidance, and testing department. Coordinate SAC/SIP. Supervise RTI/MTSS |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 10/13/2021, Marietta De Armas

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

0

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

126

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,709

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

13

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

16

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 | 705 | 710 | 691 | 733 | 2839 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 113 | 113 | 115 | 467 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 42 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 338 | 233 | 179 | 101 | 851 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 146 | 132 | 106 | 575 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 113 | 132 | 120 | 530 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 106 | 75 | 161 | 510 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 210 | 179 | 174 | 855 |

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 | 11 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 24 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/8/2021

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 | 669 | 702 | 695 | 740 | 2806 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 74 | 76 | 80 | 316 |
| 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 | 212 | 140 | 108 | 154 | 614 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 181 | 198 | 154 | 717 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 111 | 139 | 6 | 420 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 248 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 24 |

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 | 669 | 702 | 695 | 740 | 2806 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 74 | 76 | 80 | 316 |
| 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 | 212 | 140 | 108 | 154 | 614 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 181 | 198 | 154 | 717 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 111 | 139 | 6 | 420 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 248 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 24 |

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 | | | | 47% | 57% | 56% | 52% | 58% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44% | 52% | 51% | 49% | 54% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 37% | 45% | 42% | 42% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 43% | 51% | 51% | 37% | 49% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 42% | 44% | 48% | 36% | 45% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 43% | 45% | 36% | 46% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 66% | 66% | 68% | 59% | 64% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 76% | 71% | 73% | 74% | 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 | 47% | 57% | -10% | 55% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 53% | -7% | 53% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |

| 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% | 67% | -2% | 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 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 70% | 4% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 39% | 61% | -22% | 61% | -22% |
| 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 | 46% | 56% | -10% | 57% | -11% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Broward Schools- School grades and insight

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 38 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 6 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 26 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 18 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | 87 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 80 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 70 |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 48 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 10 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 15 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 14 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 9 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 33 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 66 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 27 |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | | 67 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 62 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 7 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 10 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 8 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | 23 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 4 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | | 58 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 46 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 13 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | | | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 100 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | | | 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 | 13 | 29 | 35 | 13 | 20 | 21 | 25 | 34 | | 95 | 24 |
| ELL | 20 | 43 | 49 | 19 | 22 | 28 | 26 | 28 | | 88 | 59 |
| ASN | 60 | 58 | | 29 | 26 | | 59 | 86 | | 97 | 74 |
| BLK | 39 | 40 | 38 | 13 | 18 | 23 | 51 | 48 | | 96 | 42 |
| HSP | 44 | 40 | 34 | 20 | 18 | 23 | 57 | 57 | | 91 | 53 |

| 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 | 43 | 27 | | 21 | 13 | | 60 | 73 | | 100 | 69 |
| WHT | 56 | 46 | 48 | 29 | 18 | 21 | 59 | 68 | | 96 | 66 |
| FRL | 41 | 39 | 37 | 15 | 17 | 25 | 51 | 47 | | 94 | 46 |
| 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 | 18 | 33 | 33 | 24 | 35 | 30 | 42 | 46 | | 87 | 25 |
| ELL | 31 | 44 | 40 | 37 | 50 | 49 | 56 | 56 | | 69 | 48 |
| ASN | 54 | 49 | | 55 | 48 | | 75 | 91 | | 92 | 83 |
| BLK | 38 | 43 | 38 | 35 | 35 | 31 | 54 | 70 | | 91 | 38 |
| HSP | 48 | 42 | 32 | 42 | 47 | 41 | 67 | 72 | | 89 | 55 |
| MUL | 61 | 54 | 43 | 48 | 44 | | 75 | 86 | | 96 | 36 |
| WHT | 57 | 46 | 38 | 56 | 45 | 32 | 78 | 83 | | 94 | 56 |
| FRL | 40 | 42 | 36 | 39 | 43 | 39 | 60 | 72 | | 90 | 45 |
| 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 | 24 | 36 | 38 | 15 | 25 | 28 | 44 | 52 | | 72 | 32 |
| ELL | 22 | 34 | 31 | 28 | 36 | 40 | 28 | 64 | | 83 | 51 |
| ASN | 64 | 57 | | 56 | 35 | | 76 | 80 | | 95 | 56 |
| BLK | 42 | 47 | 46 | 24 | 32 | 36 | 47 | 69 | | 91 | 29 |
| HSP | 52 | 46 | 36 | 39 | 39 | 40 | 58 | 75 | | 90 | 53 |
| MUL | 72 | 63 | | 52 | 39 | | 76 | 64 | | 90 | 42 |
| WHT | 63 | 51 | 41 | 49 | 37 | 34 | 70 | 82 | | 92 | 56 |
| FRL | 47 | 46 | 42 | 32 | 33 | 35 | 53 | 72 | | 89 | 40 |

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 | 45 |
| 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 | 51 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 497 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 90% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

In core content areas the 12th grade students across all subgroups including grade level performance is the lowest.

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

Our students with disabilities have the greatest need for improvement.

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

The ESE support team needs to be more actively involved in pushing in and pushing out for SWD. There will be a revision in the support that will be provided by the ESE support team to push in and pull out for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarter of 2021-2022 school year.

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

The 9th grade Biology students across all subgroups showed the most improved.

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

Students that are in Biology in 9th grade have a strong foundation in science from their middle school. The school created an opportunity for 9th grade students to take the Biology course.

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

Students will receive academic support after school and on Saturdays in all content areas by highly qualified and suitable instructional staff. They will be carefully selected to support these students. Common assessments will be put in place to monitor their performance and drive curriculum development and instruction.

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.

The Innovating Learning Department will come to school to enrich teachers in the areas of mastery connect, discovery education, collaborative projects, and interactive canvas assignments.

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

Continue professional training and support for the instructional staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our school's primary area of concern is theft and our secondary area is fighting. We will provide guidance to students via the positive school behavior plan. The school year begins with a grade level discipline assembly, RTI meetings bi-weekly, a social worker with support services, a school psychologist, family counselor, and four school counselors to help provide students with assistance. For major incidents we have a SRO and Guardian on staff.

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 Positive Behavior team created a list of characteristics that the students should embody; responsibility, respect, safety, and excellence. Each of the characteristics has an expectation tied to it that the students are encouraged by each of teachers and other staff members at the school. When a student is repeatedly meeting the expectations, they are acknowledge at the end of each semester.

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

Michael Warkentien-Administrator
Robin Jacobson-Clerical
Brent Maffett-BTU Representative
Andrew Reger-Teacher
Vinnie Blye-SPBP Point of Contact
George Horton-Campus Security Manager
Karen Reback-Parent/Community Representative
Jennifer Letizia-Equity Liaison

Part V: Budget

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

| | |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|