

Alachua County Public Schools

High Springs Community School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

<https://www.sbac.edu/highsprings>

Demographics

Principal: Lynn Mcneill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2021-22 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (62%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

<https://www.sbac.edu/highsprings>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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.

High Springs Community School contributes to the improvement of self, family, community, and nation.

We are committed to the success of every student!

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders work collaboratively to ensure the social, emotional and academic success of each student.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McNeill, Lynn	Principal	
BISHOP, EMERY	Assistant Principal	
Spencer, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Lynn Mcneill

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

972

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	92	97	106	104	117	116	122	115	110	0	0	0	0	979	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	10	19	14	7	5	17	26	9	0	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	2	1	5	13	7	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	1	11	19	12	11	7	8	36	20	0	0	0	0	125	
Course failure in Math	0	6	11	12	14	6	8	23	12	0	0	0	0	92	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	17	15	21	14	0	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	17	19	15	12	0	0	0	0	82	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	1	1	0	3	15	21	14	0	0	0	0	57	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	11	14	12	23	15	22	38	25	0	0	0	0	161	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	8	3	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	25	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/8/2022

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	79	102	109	117	116	98	116	108	124	0	0	0	0	969	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	15	6	17	9	30	12	24	0	0	0	0	133	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	1	8	14	15	11	5	22	26	27	0	0	0	0	129	
Course failure in Math	1	4	12	3	10	11	22	20	25	0	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	14	16	0	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15	12	0	0	0	0	42	
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	1	6	9	7	11	6	25	23	30	0	0	0	0	118

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	4	3	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	79	102	109	117	116	98	116	108	124	0	0	0	0	969	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	15	6	17	9	30	12	24	0	0	0	0	133	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	1	8	14	15	11	5	22	26	27	0	0	0	0	129	
Course failure in Math	1	4	12	3	10	11	22	20	25	0	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	14	16	0	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15	12	0	0	0	0	42	
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	1	6	9	7	11	6	25	23	30	0	0	0	0	118

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	4	3	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	56%	57%				63%	65%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	53%	55%				59%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	38%	46%				48%	46%	54%
Math Achievement	68%	57%	55%				69%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%	59%	60%				74%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	56%				63%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	54%	47%	51%				65%	60%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	69%	72%				88%	84%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2022					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
07	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	52%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2022					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2022					
	2019	81%	52%	29%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2022					
	2019	75%	59%	16%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	27%	15%	46%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	59%	55%	4%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	48%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	88%	69%	19%	71%	17%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	56%	26%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	37	25	26	45	46	23	18			
ELL	47	46		35	50						
BLK	39	46	41	42	61	47	25				
HSP	57	54	44	63	68	65	62	58	67		
MUL	42	63	60	50	64						
WHT	69	61	50	73	66	50	59	88	68		
FRL	43	52	43	49	58	47	30	61	57		
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	19	34	26	30	42	31	14	44			
ELL	30			50							
BLK	41	51	27	41	51	38	21	73			
HSP	61	68	57	64	56	23	63	93	90		
MUL	45	50		54	42						
WHT	65	62	44	72	67	49	61	89	89		
FRL	41	49	35	49	54	43	38	84	75		
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	30	43	41	30	60	54	41	53			
BLK	32	46	42	47	69	67	19	64			
HSP	65	63	50	65	67	57	68				
MUL	76	71		90	88						
WHT	68	61	51	72	75	61	72	91	77		

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
FRL	45	54	46	54	66	61	47	76	73		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
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%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based on the FDOE school grades report, HSCS earned a total of 557 points and a grade of A in 2022. The learning gain percentages for both ELA and Math were similar to the overall achievement percentages. The lowest quartile learning gains for ELA were 11 percentage points less

than the overall ELA learning gains, and the lowest quartile learning gains for Math were 14 percentage points less than the overall Math learning gains. Despite the lowest quartile learning gains being lower than the overall learning gains, they are much more similar to the overall learning gains than they were in 2021.

If a school has a subgroup of students with an overall Federal Index of 40 percent or less, the school is to plan for improvement. This year our students with disabilities overall Federal Index was at 31%. This subgroup will be a focus group for improvement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math lowest quartile continue to be the areas in greatest need for improvement. In addition, the overall performance of students with disabilities fell to 31%.

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

It is evident that strategies implemented last year were successful in closing the gap between lowest quartile learning gains and overall learning gains. Similar strategies will remain in place, however professional development in the areas of understanding the new BEST benchmarks along with implementation of the benchmarks at each grade level is imperative. In addition, we will participate in professional development for learning to implement new research based intervention strategies/use of intervention instructional materials. This professional development is part of the action that will be taken to support students with disabilities along with all students struggling to master grade level benchmarks.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains. In 2021, the percentage making learning gains was 41%. In 2022, the percentage making math learning gains was 48%.

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

HSCS has been using the Task Questioning Evidence model for math instruction K-8. Professional development for teachers began five years ago. Grade levels focus on "Big Rocks", or key standards that are absolutely necessary for students to master in order to be successful at the next grade level. The key standards are reviewed with grade levels above and below for meaningful vertical alignment.

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

Increasing the rigor of literacy instruction by analyzing BEST standards along with vertical progression and level of questions/tasks.

Implementation of standards aligned to adopted curriculum with fidelity.

We will continue to implement the support facilitation model for exceptional education students and struggling students in grades 3-8.

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.

PD in BEST Standards

Implementation of standards aligned to adopted curriculum with fidelity

iStation PD for new and returning teachers with focus on utilizing iStation data to drive instruction and grouping.

Increased SIPPS implementation across all elementary grade levels

UFLI interventions expanded to grades 3-5

Kindergarten refresher training in UFLI instruction

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

HSCS is a full service Title 1 school (K-5) this year. This status provides us with an Instructional Intervention Coach, an Intervention teacher, and two paraprofessionals who along with our High Dose tutors, will provide direct interventions to elementary students struggling in the area of reading. Title 1 provides the funding to purchase additional intervention curriculum and materials. Parent involvement activities will also be funded through Title 1.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The federal indicator, students with disabilities fell below 41% proficiency to 31% proficiency based on the 2022 FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Based on state FAST testing, HSCS students with disabilities' proficiency level (All tested areas) will improve to the equivalent of 41% or greater as compared to proficiency on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST testing three times per year.
DIBELS assessments (K-5)
CAPM progress monitoring assessments (adopted curriculum informal and formative assessments)
iStation assessments
Lowest-quartile SIPPS

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynn McNeill (mcneillm@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Support facilitation in grades 3-8 for both reading and math.
Participate in support facilitation professional development.
Professional Development leading to a deepening of school wide faculty's understanding of the BEST standards and best practices for implementation.
Incorporate UDL strategies in daily instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In order to have students with disabilities be provided the least restrictive learning environment. we will have our exceptional student education teachers support them in the regular education classroom. This year we have two ESE teachers supporting 3rd- 5th graders and two ESE teachers supporting 6th - 8th graders.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

63% of HSCS students scored at proficiency level or above in the ELA portion of the 2022 FSA. 59% of our students made their annual learning gains in the area of ELA. 48% of students in the lowest quartile made their annual learning gains. With an overall school grade of A, HSCS still has room for improvement in the area of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The percentage of students making their annual learning gains in the area of ELA as measured by the end of the year FAST assessment will increase by at least 5% in comparison to the 2022 FSA ELA results.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

DIBELS data
Lowest-quartile SIPPS tracking
iStation data
FAST data
CAPM progress monitoring assessments (adopted curriculum informal and formative assessments)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Increasing the rigor of literacy instruction by analyzing BEST standards along with the vertical progression and the level of questions/tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Because all ELA standards to be taught at each grade level are now BEST standards it is critical that we provide professional development for a deeper understanding of the standards along with a clear path for classroom implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PD in BEST Standards

Implementation of standards aligned to the adopted curriculum with fidelity

iStation PD for new and returning teachers with focus on utilizing iStation data to drive instruction and grouping.

Increased SIPPS implementation across all elementary grade levels.

UFLI interventions 3-5 support.

Kindergarten refresher training in UFLI instruction (use of program with fidelity)

iReady PD for 6-8 ELA teachers

Provide intervention support to address lowest quartile and identified achievement gap ESSA groups using district approved curriculum (UFLI, SIPPS, Great Leaps)

After school tutoring

Monthly grade level and/or department meetings to provide grade level specific professional development and/or information necessary for aligning efforts to maximize student achievement.

Person Responsible EMERY BISHOP (bishopbe@gm.sbac.edu)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Communication is key to building a positive school culture. At HSCS we vow to communicate regularly with students, families of students, teachers, staff members, and community partners in order to facilitate school improvement. Some of the communication tools to be used are as follows:

- Skylert Family Messaging System
- Skyward Family Access
- School Newsletter
- Weekly Newsletter to Faculty and Staff
- School Website and Individual Teacher Websites
- Regular Email Communication
- HSCS PTSA Facebook Page Announcements

Another important communication tool we plan to use are surveys. We will survey teachers, parents, and specific groups of students to ascertain their input regarding the school's performance in the following areas, but not limited to:

school culture
instruction and learning
equity
discipline
safety
administration

The results of these surveys are utilized to adjust and create new plans for improving any or all of the these areas.

In addition to multi level communication, HSCS celebrates achievement and good behavior. In grades K-5, we have a student of the week program where positive character traits are emphasized and rewarded. There is also a "High Flying Hawk Award" program where students are acknowledged for going above and beyond. Middle school students earn "Reward Days" each nine weeks for having little to no referrals.

Staff members are acknowledged for their above and beyond work or kindness through the weekly communication, The School Scoop. Staff Shout Out forms are also available to all staff members to provide acknowledge to fellow staff members for their hard work or kind deeds.

One of our key stakeholder groups is the HSCS School Advisory Council. The SAC provides input regarding the use of Advance Placement funds and Lottery funds. The Council reviews teacher requests for funding and determines whether or not the requests support the school's

plan for improvement. The SAC membership includes teachers, support personnel, parents, and community members. The HSCS PTSA is a strong supporter of students and teachers often organizing events to show appreciation to teachers and staff members. The PTSA also organizes fun events for students, fundraisers, and financially supports teacher requests for classroom materials and supplies. HSCS is fortunate to have numerous local organizations who support the school financially and by donating school supplies.

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

Administration - Provide leadership regarding communication and monitor communication; Support quality instruction by organizing professional development and providing feedback in regard to instruction.

Instructional Staff - Provide positive classroom environments that promote good social and communication skills.

Guidance Staff- Provide lessons, resources, and counseling for students in order to promote social and emotional health.

HSCS PTSA - Supports teachers and students in most any manner that is determined to be an area of need.

HSCS Business Partners- Provide supplies and incentives for both students and teachers