

Hernando County School District

Weeki Wachee High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	10

Weeki Wachee High School

12150 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwhs>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) High School 9-12	2017-18 Title I School No	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 30%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Where all members of the school community are responsible for ensuring learning and academic achievement for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We're all about students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
La Barbara, Troy	Principal
Burgess, Laura	Assistant Principal
Shelby, Sarah	Assistant Principal
Swihart, Stacey	Assistant Principal
Adesso, Lore	Teacher, K-12
Clark, Damien	Teacher, K-12
Clark, Summer	School Counselor
Jordan, T.J.	Teacher, K-12
Mihok, Kirsten	Teacher, ESE
Morgan, Bea	Teacher, K-12
Dejesus, Michael	Teacher, K-12
Ross, Charlene	Teacher, K-12
Maternowski, Adam	Teacher, K-12
Quarto, Mike	Teacher, K-12
Pearson, Clara	Teacher, K-12
Linauer, Marlise	Teacher, K-12
Skipper, Patrick	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meets bi-weekly to discuss and analyze data. These members are Department Chairs that lead their departments in data analysis to identify needs and collaborate possible solutions. As teacher leaders, their role is to assist the school in improving through reviewing data, targeting weak areas, and working to develop solutions to school-wide needs. In addition, these individuals are leaders to their colleagues providing support and guidance to ensure the school's expectations and goals are achieved.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	32	44	48	245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	12	11	16	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	45	51	57	175
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	31	0	0	83

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	100	104	149	498

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	0
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected

Friday 9/7/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	111	126	175	495
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	28	21	7	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	68	79	25	176
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	354	215	193	939
Level 1 on Reading statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	96	45	34	258
GPA below 2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	24	98

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	108	98	26	381

Year 2016-17 - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	111	126	175	495
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	28	21	7	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	68	79	25	176
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	354	215	193	939
Level 1 on Reading statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	96	45	34	258
GPA below 2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	24	98

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	108	98	26	381

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest performing data component was our ELA Lowest 25th percentile. It was the lowest last year as well, however the overall percentage showed a gain of 7 percentage points and, the gap between the school and state percentage narrowed by 7 percentage points.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the Math Achievement which declined by 7 percentage points.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

There are three data components that tie for the biggest gap when compared to the state average. They are ELA achievement, Science Achievement, and Social Studies Achievement.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The most improvement was shown in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile group. They gained 15 percentage points and were 6 percentage points over the District and 1 percentage point over the State

Math Lowest 25th Percentile achievement. This is not a trend due to the fact that the 2017 scores were below both the State and District Math Lowest 25th percentile achievements.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

This improvement occurred due to spiraling of weak standards and the provision of special study sessions to prepare students for the assessment.

School Data

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	48%	56%	43%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	48%	53%	35%	37%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	39%	44%	26%	26%	38%
Math Achievement	43%	47%	51%	51%	45%	43%
Math Learning Gains	44%	43%	48%	44%	40%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	40%	45%	34%	33%	38%
Science Achievement	53%	58%	67%	64%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	68%	71%	65%	71%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	121 (83)	32 (111)	44 (126)	48 (175)	245 (495)
One or more suspensions	26 (17)	12 (28)	11 (21)	16 (7)	65 (73)
Course failure in ELA or Math	22 (4)	45 (68)	51 (79)	57 (25)	175 (176)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	52 (177)	31 (354)	0 (215)	0 (193)	83 (939)

Grade Level Data

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	2018	37%	50%	-13%	53%	-16%
	2017	36%	46%	-10%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	44%	48%	-4%	53%	-9%
	2017	35%	42%	-7%	50%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

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
2018	52%	58%	-6%	65%	-13%
2017	56%	67%	-11%	63%	-7%
Compare		-4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	55%	68%	-13%	68%	-13%
2017	62%	69%	-7%	67%	-5%
Compare		-7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
2017	54%	59%	-5%	60%	-6%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	37%	45%	-8%	56%	-19%
2017	45%	50%	-5%	53%	-8%
Compare		-8%			

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	39	30	26	46	42	44	55		86	36
ELL	15	50	45	26	41		23			72	54
BLK	28	50	36	27	46	36	38	62		82	43
HSP	33	46	39	40	45	52	38	29		88	57
MUL	45	37		32	30		55	64		92	67
WHT	45	46	36	46	45	46	58	62		88	61
FRL	36	42	34	39	42	44	50	53		83	57

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	8	24	30	29	34	33	31	50		71	38
ELL	18	24		41	38						
BLK	34	40	33	38	41	40	45	46		86	42
HSP	29	34	11	44	42	29	50	54		94	43
MUL	20	15		42	33		40				
WHT	37	36	35	53	41	32	60	66		89	55
FRL	29	33	25	46	42	34	49	58		89	48

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile is the lowest performing group at WWHS. The gap between WWHS performance and state performance narrowed by 6 percentage points over the past year, and we want to continue to narrow this gap. If Lowest 25th Percentile students show growth in ELA, other content areas will be positively impacted due to the increased ability to successfully read and understand grade level material.
Intended Outcome	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will show a gain in learning gains and narrow the gap between WWHS and District/State. Our goal it to increase the ELA Lowest 25th percentile by 3 percentage points that would narrow the gap from the State reported ELA Lowest 25th percentile group.
Point Person	Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	ELA 1 and 2 teachers will identify the lowest 25th percentile students in their classes using Unify. In addition, they will analyze the data from the Spring Administration of the FSA ELA assessment to identify weak performance areas by strand in order to focus instruction through MTSS for these students. All students who earned a Level 1 or 2 on the Spring 2018 FSA ELA assessment will be placed in Intensive Reading Classes. ELA 1 and 2 and Reading teachers have common planning to facilitate communication and progress monitoring. Students not showing growth on formative assessments will receive additional support through small group and/or individual instruction as determined through MTSS process.
Person Responsible	Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Teachers will use on-going formative assessments to monitor students' progress toward mastery of the standards. The data will be reviewed weekly during common planning and shared with Administration through the data monitoring form. This data will assist in focusing instruction on increasing students' proficiency and mastery of the standards.
Person Responsible	Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget	
Total:	\$0.00