

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Alonso High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Alonso High School

8302 MONTAGUE ST, Tampa, FL 33635

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Braulio Alonso High School is a community where excellence is the goal, diversity is valued, integrity is expected, and school pride is the result.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alonso faculty, staff, parents, and community strive to provide a Raven's N.E.S.T; a Nurturing Environment for Successful Teaching.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Harris, James | Principal | The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others. The principal is responsible for all aspects of the school. |
| Warner, Matthew | Assistant Principal | Serves as the school's athletic director, facility manager, and supervisor of the student affairs office. Responsible for the day to day operation of the school building, the academic progress of all athletes, and an instructional leader within the Science PLC. |
| Hefley, Barbara | Assistant Principal | Responsible for student discipline on campus. Instructional leader for the ELA PLC. Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations. |
| Kunkel, Kristine | Assistant Principal | Responsible for student discipline on campus. Instructional leader for the Math PLC. Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations. |
| Norton, Keven | Assistant Principal | Responsible for student discipline on campus. Instructional leader for the Social Studies PLC. Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations. |
| Fitzgerald, Trisha | Assistant Principal | Responsible for the School's curriculum program, student scheduling, and test administration. Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations. Collaborates with ILT and other instructional leaders. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Meetings were conducted among a variety of stakeholders in the development of the school's SIP. The school's administrative team, Instructional Leadership team, each PLC, our student leadership group, and community members all participated during preplanning and subsequent meetings after school began to develop our SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The goals of the SIP will be monitored on a bi-weekly basis. Every other Monday after student dismissal, our PLC groups monitor district provided and teacher created progress monitoring assessments that detail how our students are progressing towards meeting their individual and school wide goals for achievement. For our students who struggle academically, teachers will collaborate within their PLC's to determine next steps in meeting the needs of these students. Small group instruction, tutoring, and effective teacher assignment will all be used as potential strategies to assist our students. In addition to our PLC's, our ILT meets on non-PLC Mondays to review reports produced by our PLC's and review our data points. Staff development and instructional coaching opportunities are derived based on the progress of our students.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 73% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 82% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 756 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 485 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 283 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 55 | 51 | 50 | 61 | 52 | 51 | 57 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 56 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 51 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 51 | 42 | 38 | 51 | 39 | 38 | 34 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 29 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42 | | | 25 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 76 | 64 | 64 | 72 | 46 | 40 | 71 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 76 | 69 | 66 | 75 | 49 | 48 | 72 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 41 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 95 | 89 | 89 | 97 | 64 | 61 | 97 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 61 | 62 | 65 | 58 | 72 | 67 | 48 | | |
| ELP Progress | 49 | 39 | 45 | 69 | | | 70 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 463 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | 95 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 687 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | 97 |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 45 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | | | |
| BLK | 66 | | | |
| HSP | 61 | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 60 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 45 | | | |
| ELL | 53 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | |
| HSP | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 61 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 57 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 55 | | | 51 | | | 76 | 76 | | 95 | 61 | 49 |
| SWD | 24 | | | 25 | | | 56 | 54 | | 23 | 6 | |
| ELL | 34 | | | 35 | | | 56 | 43 | | 53 | 7 | 49 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | | | 88 | | | 94 | 97 | | 86 | 6 | |
| BLK | 46 | | | 44 | | | 72 | 81 | | 50 | 6 | |
| HSP | 49 | | | 44 | | | 70 | 65 | | 57 | 7 | 50 |
| MUL | 57 | | | 56 | | | 79 | 77 | | 46 | 6 | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | 64 | | | 86 | 90 | | 71 | 6 | |
| FRL | 47 | | | 41 | | | 67 | 67 | | 53 | 7 | 51 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 61 | 63 | 49 | 51 | 50 | 42 | 72 | 75 | | 97 | 58 | 69 |
| SWD | 28 | 57 | 51 | 30 | 43 | 40 | 44 | 41 | | 89 | 28 | |
| ELL | 25 | 50 | 48 | 34 | 42 | 47 | 56 | 56 | | 96 | 62 | 69 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 94 | 83 | | 81 | 78 | | 91 | 83 | | 97 | 79 | |
| BLK | 46 | 49 | 48 | 44 | 46 | | 65 | 78 | | 97 | 41 | |
| HSP | 53 | 59 | 49 | 43 | 49 | 39 | 64 | 67 | | 95 | 52 | 69 |
| MUL | 65 | 62 | 40 | 37 | 53 | | 63 | 57 | | 100 | 72 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 68 | 42 | 67 | 50 | 33 | 86 | 86 | | 99 | 67 | |
| FRL | 51 | 58 | 47 | 42 | 47 | 41 | 64 | 67 | | 95 | 49 | 65 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 57 | 56 | 51 | 34 | 29 | 25 | 71 | 72 | | 97 | 48 | 70 |
| SWD | 24 | 46 | 47 | 22 | 33 | 26 | 36 | 38 | | 91 | 11 | |
| ELL | 31 | 52 | 54 | 30 | 31 | 33 | 51 | 49 | | 95 | 39 | 70 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 79 | 65 | | 71 | 33 | | 88 | 85 | | 100 | 73 | |
| BLK | 48 | 45 | 32 | 25 | 24 | 18 | 61 | 53 | | 98 | 43 | |
| HSP | 48 | 53 | 51 | 29 | 27 | 23 | 63 | 67 | | 97 | 41 | 69 |
| MUL | 63 | 58 | | 43 | 32 | | 76 | 67 | | 100 | 54 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 63 | 63 | 42 | 33 | 27 | 81 | 84 | | 98 | 58 | |
| FRL | 49 | 54 | 52 | 27 | 26 | 23 | 64 | 62 | | 96 | 38 | 67 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 50% | 5% | 50% | 5% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 48% | 2% | 48% | 2% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 55% | -11% | 50% | -6% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 49% | 9% | 48% | 10% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 74% | 62% | 12% | 63% | 11% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 65% | 7% | 63% | 9% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest proficiency component was our overall ELA performance. 52% of all ninth and tenth grade students scored at proficiency. Although this was higher than the district average, it is a decrease from the previous school year. It is important to note that the ELA FAST test was new to our students so it is difficult to make a direct comparison to the FSA exam previously administered. Additional contributing factors that impacted our proficiency was having two instructional vacancies in ELA for most of the school year and not having a writing component to the ELA proficiency score. Our ELA team does an excellent job of teaching writing and not having that as a component of FAST negatively impacted our score.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA proficiency was the greatest decline from the prior year. As stated in the previous section, having two ELA teaching vacancies for most of the school year in conjunction with no writing as a component of the ELA FAST test contributed to the decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All released data components were above state and district averages. The largest gap between the state and Alonso scores was seen in the areas of Biology and US History. Both were nine percentage points higher than the state average. Factors that contributed to this success were the strategic assignment of teachers in these areas and the intentional focus of our PLC's in these two content areas.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the greatest improvement from the previous year was our school's college and career acceleration rate. We improved six percentage points. New actions that contributed to this increase included a concerted effort to ensure nearly all seniors with an acceleration option within their schedule and our acceleration PLC tracking student progress throughout the year and adjusting instructional techniques to meet the needs of our students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Although EWS data was not required, two areas of potential concern are the ELA proficiency rates of our SWD and ELL subgroups.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Priority One: with student gains returning to the school grade component for this school year, monitoring overall student progress and bottom quartile progress in ELA will be essential. With over 50 percent of our students increasing an entire learning level from last school year's progress monitoring one assessment to the FAST assessment in May, this is an area we need to equal or exceed this upcoming school year.

Priority Two: with student gains returning to the school grade component for this school year, monitoring overall student progress and bottom quartile progress in Math will be essential. Students made continuous improvement from progress monitoring one assessment to the BEST assessment last school year. We will need to equal or exceed these results this school year.

Priority Three: in the past three school years, our school acceleration rate improved over 20 percentage points. Given our focus on acceleration with purposeful scheduling and monitoring, achieving an acceleration near 75 percent is achievable.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Alonso students are traditionally very compliant. Classroom management issues are not typical. To encourage additional academic growth, as measured by state assessments and semester/final exams, the faculty and staff have determined daily lesson objectives need to be purposeful and tied to standards/benchmarks with activities that are student centered providing opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of that lesson. This has become our teaching mantra. This daily approach to lesson development became more prevalent last school year. With academic gains returning this year, we want to see this incorporated school wide, with an emphasis on students having an opportunity every day to demonstrate their mastery of the objective.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a focus on student centered instruction and demonstration of mastery, we expect to see ELA proficiency to improve to 55%, with all learning gains at 58% and bottom quartile gains at 50%. In Math, we expect to see proficiency at 56%, with all learning gains at 55% and bottom quartile gains at 50%. In Science, we expect our Biology EOC proficiency to improve to 75% and our social studies US History EOC proficiency to improve to 76%. For our semester and final exams, we expect all content areas to be above the district average.

Monitoring:

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

In addition to PM1 and PM2 data points, we will be incorporating district common assessments in content areas where available. Where not available or in addition to, our PLC's will analyze student success, create common assessments, and analyze that data during each PLC cycle with a focus on student achievement. As the year progresses, student subgroups will be identified for more small group instruction, pull outs, and potential reassignment of teachers to best meet the needs of these students. PLC's meet every other Monday after student dismissal to carefully monitor student progress. Our ILT meets every non-PLC Monday to review the outcomes of our PLC's and provide additional coaching and staff development to achieve our school wide goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Harris (james.harris@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In addition to PM1 and PM2 data, common assessments will be used the PLC's to monitor student achievement. Additionally, classroom walkthroughs by administration and ILT will be used for coaching opportunities to provide additional feedback towards engagement and assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Common assessments developed by each PLC group, in conjunction with district provided progress monitoring assessments, will determine if student achievement is occurring. That data will then be used to drive the instructional practice determined by the PLC group in the planning phase of our PLC's. PLC leaders, department heads, ILT members, and the AP's assigned to these areas monitor the outcomes of PLCs to ensure focus remains on student centered instruction and assessment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

During preplanning, PLC groups will be formed and PLC leaders selected. Common planning for the first two weeks of school will be implemented to assist with any schedule changes that could take place.

Person Responsible: Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

By When: This action step will be concluded by the end of preplanning.

During the first month of school, ILT members and the APs assigned to the content areas will monitor the common planning and assessment tools produced by the PLCs. Additionally, results from PM1 will be analyzed by administration, ILT, and PLC groups to begin the differentiation process with instruction.

Person Responsible: Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

By When: This action step will be concluded by mid-September (once PM1 data has been analyzed by stakeholders).

Common assessment data will be reviewed throughout the year to monitor student achievement and develop next steps for instruction. The ILT, PLCs, and administration will monitor progress monitoring assessments monthly until PM3.

Person Responsible: Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

By When: This action step will conclude in May 2024.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For the past three years, the Alonso daily attendance rate has dropped to around 90%. Additionally, the number of students tardy to class the past two years has increased. These are areas that need to improve so that student achievement in the areas of ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies can improve. Improving student achievement will become more achievable if students are present in school more consistently and arrive to class on time and not miss instructional time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to see our daily attendance rate improve to 93%. Additionally, our goal is to have over 50% of our student population not have a tardy at the end of each nine weeks grading period.

Monitoring:

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

Our attendance clerk will provide the daily attendance rate to administration daily. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will monitor this data weekly. AP Keven Norton will lead an Attendance Committee that will review this data on a monthly basis. AP Barbara Hefley will provide weekly tardy reports to the PSLT as well. Dr. Linda Perdue, our Climate and Culture Resource Teacher, in conjunction with PBIS, will create a school wide and individual student incentive program for attending school and not having tardies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keven Norton (keven.norton@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

During preplanning, a professional development training was provided to all teachers about the importance of establishing a positive learning environment in each class. Four teachers, along with our CCRT and an AP, provided examples of strategies used that resulted in fewer attendance and tardy outcomes. The attendance committee will identify at risk attendance students and begin parental and student interventions within the first month of school. For our students with perfect attendance and/or no tardies, they will receive rewards during lunch and during our quarterly A Team celebrations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order for student to find greater academic success, they must be present in class on a daily basis. Improving the learning environment/culture in all classes should result in a decrease in skipping and tardy data. Classes that follow the Alonso mantra of student-centered instruction should make learning more impactful and also contribute to students attending and being more punctual. Involving parents in the intervention process by our attendance committee along with student incentives should net positive results.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Prior to preplanning and continuing throughout the school year, the principal will address attendance/tardies and the rationale for success to parents via the every Sunday parentlink call, email, and text message.

Person Responsible: James Harris (james.harris@hcps.net)

By When: The action step will occur weekly until the end of the school year.

The attendance committee will meet by the second full week of school to review historical attendance information, establish protocols for monitoring and addressing attendance concerns, and create additional incentives for positive attendance results.

Person Responsible: Keven Norton (keven.norton@hcps.net)

By When: This action step will occur during the second full week of school in August with the attendance committee meeting on a monthly basis until May 2024.

An incentive plan for tardies will be established by the second full week of school.

Person Responsible: Barbara Hefley (barbara.hefley@hcps.net)

By When: This action step will be established by the second full week of school and continue throughout the school year until May 2024.

#3. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Whole school acceleration is an area of continued growth. Although we have made significant progress the past three school years, we have not met our acceleration goal of 70% for all 4-year cohort students. Continued improvement in acceleration will not only help our overall school grade but it will help our graduating seniors become college and career ready.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to exceed 70% acceleration for the 20-21 graduation cohort. We believe 73% is achievable. This will be determined by calculating the number of students who passed a dual enrollment course, achieved a 3 or higher on an AP exam, complete an IB program, and earn an industry certification.

Monitoring:

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

Our ILT member from our Business Department, along with an AP, are responsible for this PLC group and will monitor industry certification practice results during semester one and semester two. The PLC will determine every month which students are ready for IC testing and coordinate the testing and proctoring schedule. For students with a 3.0 GPA or higher who have not earned their acceleration at the start of this school year, they have been placed in the First Year Experience dual enrollment course for either semester one or semester two. The IB Coordinator has been monitoring IB student progress and will continue to do so throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The PLC will focus on practice tests to determine if successful student progress is being made for the industry certifications. Seniors who show immediate potential to pass the IC will be targeted first; remaining seniors will have their IC instruction differentiated to determine when during semester one they will test. Dual enrollment instructors will monitor student progress to ensure all students finish with a C or higher for the course.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

For industry certification success, students who show success on the practice tests tend to demonstrate a successful end result with their industry certification. IC teachers will continue to plan and implement practice tests within their PLC to provide students the best opportunity to demonstrate success. For dual enrollment courses, teachers actively monitoring student grades will help ensure that the overwhelming majority of these students earn a C or better for the course, thus earning acceleration.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

During preplanning, the principal and APC will identify students within the 20-21 cohort who have not earned acceleration and confirm they are in an IC, AP, or Dual Enrollment course. The IC PLC will meet during this time to identify the seniors on their class rosters who have not earned acceleration and begin planning when IC tests will be administered.

Person Responsible: Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

By When: The action step will be implemented during preplanning and conclude once the school year begins.

During each PLC session, teachers will review student progress towards the IC. Common practice tests will be created for the areas in which the IC will be offered. This process will be repeated during every PLC session and for the duration of the school year.

Person Responsible: Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

By When: The action step will be implemented at the start of the year and conclude in May 2024.

Our annual Career and College Fair are scheduled for the first grading period to assist with student career and collegiate readiness. Students will be able learn more about the collegiate and career opportunities that exist after graduation. These events help students realize the value of earning a high school diploma.

Person Responsible: James Harris (james.harris@hcps.net)

By When: The Career and College Fairs will take place in late September and early October 2023.