

Jefferson County School District

Jefferson County High A Somerset Charter School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Jefferson County High A Somerset Charter School

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

somersetjefferson.org

Demographics

Principal: Cory Oliver

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-06-30
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)	0%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Jefferson 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Jefferson County High A Somerset Charter School

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

somersetjefferson.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Jefferson 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.

Jefferson County K-12: A Somerset School promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed learners in a safe and enriching environment to support future life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jefferson County K-12: A Somerset School will be the first diverse rural school system to work with families and community to successfully educate all of its students at high levels.

All students will learn Tiger PRIDE: Persistence, Responsibility, Independence, Dedication, and Excellence.

Tiger Pledge

* A Somerset Tiger will not disrupt nor allow anyone else to disrupt the sanctity of our learning environment. A Somerset Tiger will not demean or disrespect the self nor another Tiger by words, actions, or technology. A Somerset Tiger is strong, courageous, and even in failure has the heart to still win. A Somerset Tiger will not lower the self to a standard lesser greatness.

Somerset Tiger teachers, administrators, parents, and the community share the responsibility for advancing the school's mission so all Tigers will achieve.

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
Oliver, Cory	Principal	
Pons, John	Administrative Support	
	Assistant Principal	
Barany, Shirrie	Other	
	Other	
Gainey, Andre	Assistant Principal	
Wilcoxson, Raven	Other	
Roddenberry, Nicole	Reading Coach	
West, Rowena	Math Coach	
Rivera, Maribel	ELL Compliance Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/14/2014, Cory Oliver

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective

Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. Note:

For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

189

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

7

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

11

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	56	47	57	29	189
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	28	39	26	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	11	7	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	20	7	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	23	11	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	13	17	4	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	22	27	15	98

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	11	6	7	4	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	56	47	57	29	189
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	41	55	27	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	2	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	11	7	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	20	7	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	23	11	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	13	17	4	63

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	35	31	41	16	123

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	11	6	7	4	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4	22

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				29%	29%	56%	41%	41%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				36%	36%	51%	56%	56%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	37%	42%	47%	47%	44%
Math Achievement				24%	24%	51%	26%	26%	51%
Math Learning Gains				27%	27%	48%	64%	64%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	47%	45%	90%	90%	45%
Science Achievement				52%	52%	68%	45%	45%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				61%	61%	73%	54%	54%	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	27%	27%	0%	55%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	26%	26%	0%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

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	50%	50%	0%	67%	-17%

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	54%	54%	0%	70%	-16%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	20%	32%	-12%	61%	-41%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	18%	18%	0%	57%	-39%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25										
BLK	24	23	18	17	11			33		83	40
HSP	30	50									
WHT	47	44		27	31					82	
FRL	28	32	31	13	17			31		87	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
BLK	25	35	42	16	18	50	46	68		77	50
HSP	31	25		36	50						
WHT	50	55		40							
FRL	27	29	33	16	24	45	56	65		81	35
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
BLK	41	58	50	20	67		43	46		58	62
WHT	50			54							
FRL	37	50	42	26	62		44	46		54	67

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	35
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	313
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
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	40
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
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	31
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?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate 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?

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Following the review of the ESSA subgroup, the Hispanic students earned 36% of the Federal Index. This is one of the two lowest performing subgroups in the school. The MTSS team has identified an increasing number of students within this subgroup that are below grade level in ELA and/or mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2021-2022, the Hispanic student population will earn at least 40% of the Federal Index.

Monitoring:

The ESOL Coordinator and School Social Worker will work collaboratively to monitor academic and social-emotional behavior of the subgroup.
For referred students, the social worker will conduct check-ins with the students and counselor(s). Class performance and progress monitoring data will be reviewed by the ESOL coordinator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maribel Rivera (mrivera@somersetjefferson.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Lesson planning and implementation will include Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategies embedded within all subject areas.

Support from Florida's school climate transformation grant (SCTG) in providing counseling and mental health support to address behavior and environmental factors.

Level 1 and Level 2 ELL, Hispanic students will be scheduled into developmental language arts course in addition to core English-Language Arts course for additional support in English language acquisition.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Kagan structures demonstrate a strong impact in reducing discipline referrals in schools world-wide (https://www.kaganonline.com/free_articles/research_and_rationale/490/Kagan-Structures-Decrease-Disruptive-Behavior).

Research suggests that the most successful ESL program models have students learning English in a mainstream classroom. Students in the developmental language arts course will also receive a variety of learning strategy supports that relate to English language acquisition.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assistant Principal will coordinate Kagan professional development opportunities throughout the school year.
2. ESOL Coordinator will identify all level 1 and level 2 students, scheduling them into developmental language arts courses and additionally structuring a schedule for push-in and pull-out support times.
3. ESOL Coordinator will update and hold initial LEP plan review and implementation conferences.
4. The MTSS team will monitor student performance.
5. School social worker will assist students in need of support with behavior or environmental concerns impeding their progress.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Following the review of the ESSA subgroup data, the economically disadvantaged student subgroup earned 41% of the Federal Index. This is one of the two lowest performing subgroups in the school. The MTSS team has identified a growing number of students with this subgroup that are below grade level in ELA and/or Math.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, the economically disadvantaged subgroup student performance will increase to 45%.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will occur through academic and behavior progress monitoring tools. The leadership team will ensure the fidelity of instruction at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 for academics using subject-specific benchmark assessments, review of lesson plans, classroom walk-throughs, and feedback from department meetings. Behavior will be monitored monthly through disciplinary reporting from the school's SIS (Focus) in collaboration with discretionary project, PBIS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The reading and math coaches will support K-12 teachers with best-practice teaching strategies (Kagan) using evidence-based curriculum and materials. The coaches will play an integral role in targeted lesson planning based on data from benchmark assessments.</p> <p>The student services department will collaborate with PBIS for training in establishing a Tier 2 behavioral support system to mitigate maladaptive behaviors, boost self-regulation, and empower students to maximize their learning opportunities, with the overall goal to reduce time spent out of the classroom.</p> <p>Kagan Cooperative Learning will be used to increase student engagement and to create an equal learning opportunity for all students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>PBIS Evidence supports the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions in major disciplinary infractions, antisocial behavior, and substance abuse. Reductions in aggressive behavior and improvements in emotional regulation. Improvements in academic engagement and achievement. Improvements in perceptions of organizational health and school safety. Reductions in teacher and student reported bullying behavior and victimization. Improvements in perceptions of school climate. Reductions in teacher turnover. <p>(https://pbisnetwork.org/resources/introduction-to-swpbis/?gclid=CjwKCAjw1JeJBhB9EiwAV612yyFbGyd8RSOs0fA6Vm2KJt0e7e8wgnrOvbCCFIfuJfrue4keBlpLRoCeX4QAvD_BwE)</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. The MTSS coordinator will generate reports to review progress of all SWD students as well as analyze any apparent trends or concerns.
2. The School Social Worker will coordinate behavioral/mental health services for students identified by the MTSS team.
3. The Curriculum Director will implement instructional focus calendars for all grade levels and subject areas.
4. The reading and math coaches will identify common planning times to plan for targeted instruction and assessment.
5. Bi-monthly assessments will be developed and analyzed by departments, coaches, and administrators to

identify areas of focus and for improvement.

6. Student services will meet monthly to analyze student data and trends.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Discipline data since 2019-2020 demonstrates a significant decrease in the number of disciplinary infractions and suspensions. Upon the initiation of PBIS framework and establishing a referral processing system, the school became better able to improve school culture and environment through the lens of behavior and discipline. The student services department shares out monthly disciplinary progress with teachers and staff through visualizations and raw data. Any significant concerns with behavior based on monthly analysis are addressed through action planning which includes professional development, development of incentives, and MTSS review.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00