Strawberry Crest High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Strawberry Crest High School

4691 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christina Raburn

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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)	78%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Strawberry Crest High School

4691 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[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	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To become the district's leader in developing successful students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To Create Responsible Empowered Scholars for Tomorrow (CREST)

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
Raburn, Christina	Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and support PD opportunities.
Hobbs, Trent	Assistant Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and reflection of progression toward our goals
Menne, Erin	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee; oversee SIP and it's implementation
Parker, Angela	Teacher, Adult	Working collaboratively with the Principal and HCTA teacher representative to organize and oversee the voting process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Christina Raburn

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.*
2

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
110

Total number of students enrolled at the school
2,428

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
26

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

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	724	664	556	492	2436
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	153	145	96	518
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	36	15	8	107
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	3	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	3	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	3	0	0	0	102

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	14	17	6	2	39

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	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/18/2021

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	654	610	529	432	2225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	179	128	110	557
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3	15
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	0	0	0	137	144	87	68	436
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	97	27	28	262

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	3	3	2	1	9

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	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	0	0	0	654	610	529	432	2225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	179	128	110	557
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3	15
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	0	0	0	137	144	87	68	436
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	97	27	28	262

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	3	3	2	1	9

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	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				59%	56%	56%	54%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	54%	51%	57%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	41%	42%	45%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				59%	49%	51%	64%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				60%	48%	48%	66%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	45%	45%	65%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				82%	69%	68%	74%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	75%	73%	78%	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
09	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	79%	66%	13%	67%	12%
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%	73%	1%	70%	4%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	50%	63%	-13%	61%	-11%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	57%	8%	57%	8%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Achieve 3000

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68%	75%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.97%	21.69%	24.28%
	Students With Disabilities	93%	100%	99%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49.30%	70.48%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.15%	76.01%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	68.20%	81.94%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	86.03%	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	56.90%	64.00%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	52.80%	59.35%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	81.50%	77.28%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	NA	24.62%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	24.62%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	70%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.65%	27.23%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	79%	81%	79%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42.60%	59.96%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	45.95%	55.76%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	42.60%	45.71%	NA
	English Language Learners	45.75%	38.96%	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32.40%	38.16%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.40%	35.02%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	32.40%	55.72%	NA
	English Language Learners	27.20%	83.30%	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60.90%	69.00%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.90%	69.00%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	13.60%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18.54%	9.25%	15.32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	34%	17%	15%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.30%	52.76%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.30%	52.76%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	23.30%	25.25%	NA
	English Language Learners	35.70%	36.44%	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17.80%	28.26%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.80%	28.26%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	22.40%	28.26%	NA
	English Language Learners	6.60%	40.38%	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49.20%	37.74%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.40%	35.79%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	53.50%	35.78%	NA
	English Language Learners	36.85%	24.99%	NA

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	0%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.30%	28.06%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.30%	28.06%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	23.30%	33.60%	NA
	English Language Learners	29.00%	19.81%	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.90%	53.50	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	83.08%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	23.92%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

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	14	30	30	25	37	42	20	11		91	33
ELL	14	36	34	27	44	48	33	31		96	30
ASN	97	74		80	61		99	96		100	93
BLK	51	48	36	32	25		54	75		100	62
HSP	39	46	35	42	47	55	59	50		98	49

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	75	72		77	55		87	75		100	71
WHT	64	56	40	56	42	35	73	73		98	64
FRL	38	45	33	42	45	50	56	50		97	44

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	16	38	32	24	47	46	8	23		95	22
ELL	12	38	35	39	52	71	41	32		89	34
ASN	96	76		88	92		100	100		100	89
BLK	59	46	15	45	41		68	76		92	58
HSP	43	50	34	52	58	62	71	59		96	51
MUL	86	65		65	75		83	72			
WHT	66	60	50	65	63	65	88	77		95	66
FRL	42	51	36	51	57	56	71	62		93	50

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	36	36	38	47	53	39	41		88	33
ELL	8	37	39	46	50	57	30	34		79	39
ASN	93	69		100	87		96	97		100	93
BLK	50	51	38	63	79	70	95	75		97	56
HSP	39	51	43	58	65	72	62	67		91	58
MUL	78	53		73	55		100	90		100	61
WHT	59	60	51	65	63	55	75	84		97	64
FRL	36	49	45	54	60	63	61	66		92	53

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	88
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	54
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	53
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	77
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	60
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	51
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?

Students with Disabilities performed below the federal index.

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

Students with Disabilities demonstrated the greatest need for improvement in our sub-categories as they were 6% below the Federal Index.

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

Students are exposed to rigorous content through differentiated instruction that is aligned to the standards. (Deep Engagement)

Students are provided with numerous opportunities to actively engage in the learning process. (High Expectations, Strong Instruction, Standards Based Instruction)

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

The area of Science showed the greatest improvement.

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

Students are exposed to rigorous content through differentiated instruction that is aligned to the standards. (Deep Engagement)

Students are provided with numerous opportunities to actively engage in the learning process. (High Expectations, Strong Instruction, Standards Based Instruction)

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

Students are exposed to rigorous content through differentiated instruction that is aligned to the standards. (Deep Engagement)

Students are provided with numerous opportunities to actively engage in the learning process. (High Expectations, Strong Instruction, Standards Based 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.

Differentiated Instruction; Learning Engagement, technology trainings, etc...

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

Prioritize the social emotional wellness of students and educators as a foundation for learning. (Culture & Relationships)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELL student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL student achievement will increase 5% on FSA ELA when best teaching practices are embedded in all content areas through rigorous tasks that are aligned with grade level and content area standards.
Monitoring:	Achieve 3000, Reading and English class grades, online FSA practice.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy, utilization of Migrant advocate to encourage community support, and AVID professional development/best teaching practices implementation through monthly PD opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach. ELL PD trains teachers to successfully implement reading and writing strategies for ELL students that will impact all subject areas. This helps students with success in all areas of school and for post-secondary readiness.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELL PD
2. Literacy PD
2. AVID PD
4. Achieve 3000 data review
5. Communication between stakeholders utilizing Spanish speakers.
6. Post-Secondary Readiness: enrichment activities, internships, community service, or service learning to explore careers and colleges.

Person Responsible	Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase SWD Student Achievement

Measurable Outcome:	SWD student achievement will increase 5% on FSA ELA when best teaching practices are embedded in all content areas through rigorous tasks that are aligned with grade level and content area standards.
Monitoring:	Conference with teachers of SWD regularly to reflect on progress and student data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy and AVID professional development/best teaching practices implementation through monthly PD opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach. We train 80,000 educators annually to close the opportunity gap, so they can prepare all students for college, careers, and life. Example of data: First-generation, low-income AVID alumni who go to college are four times more likely to graduate than their national peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Literacy PD
2. AVID PD
3. Best Practices/Literacy/AVID implementation
4. Data review
5. Communication between stakeholders

Person Responsible	Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Postsecondary Readiness	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Postsecondary Readiness - To prepare students for their next step by earning their high school diploma.

Measurable Outcome:	Raise all school grade indicators by at least 1%.
Monitoring:	DH monitor teacher implementation of strategies; student-work submitted to office; student outcomes on school indicators.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development (providing more opportunities for PD that align specifically to school wide instructional priorities); Monthly AVID/Literacy Coach Professional Development opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach. We train 80,000 educators annually to close the opportunity gap, so they can prepare all students for college, careers, and life. Example of data: First-generation, low-income AVID alumni who go to college are four times more likely to graduate than their national peers.

Action Steps to Implement

School-wide implementation of research based learning strategies; ie AVID/WICOR monthly strategies, Best Practices implementation, Quarterly Reading/Writing Strategies, etc...

Person Responsible	Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

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.

According to SafeSchoolsfor Alex.org, we rank very low amongst state high schools in violent incidents and property incidents. We are ranked in the middle for drug/public order incidents (286/505) and suspensions (200/505). These are areas of concern we will address through the new county-mandated vape course for students, and through using our Climate and Culture Dean in utilizing remediation efforts instead of suspensions.

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.

Students are exposed to rigorous content through differentiated instruction that is aligned to the standards. (Deep Engagement)

Students are provided with numerous opportunities to actively engage in the learning process. (High Expectations, Strong Instruction, Standards Based Instruction)

Prioritize the social emotional wellness of students and educators as a foundation for learning. (Culture & Relationships)

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

Instructional Leadership Team, School Advisory Council with student/parent/teacher/admin/community membership, ACT Now (mental health awareness), school counselors, Social Worker(s) and Psychologist.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Postsecondary Readiness	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00