

Pasco County Schools

Anclore High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Anclore High School

1540 SWEETBRIAR DR, Holiday, FL 34691

<https://ahs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Vanessa Moon

Start Date for this Principal: 5/29/2018

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2018-19 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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Anclore High School

1540 SWEETBRIAR DR, Holiday, FL 34691

<https://ahs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

We are a high-achieving, student focused community of learners exhibiting passion, commitment and unity. Our goal is to make a difference for our students and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Why?

Fulfill the promise of preparing students for College, Career, and Life.

What?

Provide students with a rigorous and relevant educational experience that maximizes student engagement and is founded in meaningful relationships.

How?

Focus PLCs on alignment of curriculum, best practices, and common assessments.

Provide differentiated support for intervention and remediation.

Strengthen academic, social, emotional, and behavioral readiness levels of students as 21st century learners.

Monitor progress through data analysis of key indicators.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moon, Vanessa	Principal	
Beatty, Alondra	Assistant Principal	
Caldwell, Dillard	Assistant Principal	
Feyedelem, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Lanser, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Vantassel, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Holloman, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	
Collins, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Sparks, Erica	School Counselor	
Mizeski, Mike	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Wright, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	
Anges, Kali	Assistant Principal	
Uscategui, Mari	Teacher, K-12	
	Assistant Principal	James Smith
Smith, James	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	317	345	249	285	1196	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	54	28	63	184	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	84	56	48	255	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	127	80	84	348	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	123	83	68	397	

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	80	118	77	80	355	

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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	57%	56%	41%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	53%	51%	46%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	42%	40%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	45%	56%	51%	41%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	49%	48%	46%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	42%	45%	33%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	70%	68%	56%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	73%	73%	67%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	317 (0)	345 (0)	249 (0)	285 (0)	1196 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	39 ()	54 ()	28 ()	63 ()	184 (0)
One or more suspensions	67 ()	84 ()	56 ()	48 ()	255 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	57 ()	127 ()	80 ()	84 ()	348 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	123 ()	123 ()	83 ()	68 ()	397 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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
2019	59%	68%	-9%	67%	-8%
2018	51%	65%	-14%	65%	-14%
Compare		8%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	69%	-4%	70%	-5%
2018	56%	70%	-14%	68%	-12%
Compare		9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	60%	-19%	61%	-20%
2018	30%	63%	-33%	62%	-32%
Compare		11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	62%	-12%	57%	-7%
2018	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data

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	13	27	21	16	35	31	24	44		65	21
ELL	19	46	39	31	39	27	26			71	40
ASN	60	79		83	64		55				
BLK	23	32	40	24	59	42	41	58		91	10

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
HSP	43	42	29	43	51	38	54	67		80	18
MUL	45	47		46	47		48	79		77	40
WHT	51	52	41	48	58	53	66	68		84	42
FRL	42	48	37	44	56	51	57	66		82	34
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	13	22	13	20	64		21	49		59	12
ELL	11	31		32				18		73	
ASN	62	67		80							
BLK	18	34	27	7	20	27	21	46		71	24
HSP	42	52	34	40	52	29	53	43		73	33
MUL	49	51		48	58		58	58		69	
WHT	46	44	20	47	53	36	54	64		79	37
FRL	40	45	26	39	52	34	47	55		73	33
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	11	35	26	16	35	26	28	27		71	13
ELL	13	25	23	27	40		20				
BLK	35	41	39	19	27	15	41	53		71	27
HSP	35	35	29	39	51	35	39	54		76	59
MUL	42	62		50	37		67	57		82	
WHT	44	49	42	43	47	38	62	72		74	38
FRL	38	45	40	37	44	34	53	63		71	37

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	68
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	42
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	46
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	54
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	56
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 Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA Lowest 25% (ELL and ESE Students)
Missing foundational skills, attendance
Lack of Tier III supports school wide in grades 9&10

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

We did not have a decline in any area except to the area of math. This is only when we include students who took the test who are not enrolled in the course. We also know that we tested the 12th graders in Geometry last year in December, which affected their performance. We will be phasing out seniors taking Geometry in 12th grade.

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.

ELL and Science performance. A major barrier was the lack of teachers in these areas. We were missing out ESOL support for about a year. We also had high turn over and permanent substitutes in the science department.

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

Lowest 25% performance increased. Our school put in some deliberate monitoring systems that began with the teachers identifying their own students. We began working on implementing Tier II and III interventions for students and increased the frequency of our problem solving/MTSS meetings. We also focused on school wide writing strategies.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

9th grade discipline
12th grade attendance

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

1. ESE
2. ELL
3. ELA Achievement (Lowest 25%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ESE Performance
Rationale	Our ESE students are performing below the ESSA threshold at 30%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase the performance of ESE students to 41% as well as to increase their participation and success in acceleration opportunities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dillard Caldwell (dycaldwe@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify ESE students for Tier II and III interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	CFA Writing Assessments Quarterly Check Data
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide PD for VE teachers to monitor various assessments for their students in regards to CFA, Quarterly Checks and Writing Assignments 2. Train Teachers in the area of FSA Writing Rubric 3. ESE PLC will monitor student performance and create Tier II and III interventions for their students 4. Obtain district support to increase the efficiency of ESE paperwork completion so that student contact time may be increased.
Person Responsible	Dillard Caldwell (dycaldwe@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELL Student Performance
Rationale	Our ELL students performed below the ESSA threshold at 39%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our ELL student performance measures will increase from 39% to 43% this school year. We will also increase the graduation rate of our ELL students by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Vanessa Moon (vmoon@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Maintain highly qualified ESOL IA for full year Provide PD to teachers for best practices for ELL students Provide specific school counseling services for ELL students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Maintain highly qualified ESOL IA for full year- we have not had a full year of services in the past two years. Consistency will help these students. Provide PD to teachers for best practices for ELL students- Teachers will be best prepared to serve ELL students Provide specific school counseling services for ELL students- Closer monitoring of their progress towards graduation rate will be in place.
Action Step	
Description	1. All teachers will participate in Culturally Relevant Teaching and Trauma Informed Care 2. Retain current ESOL IA 3. Identify a school counselor to work with ELL students
Person Responsible	Vanessa Moon (vmoon@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	ELA Lowest 25% Performance
Rationale	Our students in ELA showed the greatest deficit from the state average this past school year with with 47% and 42% in 9th and 10th grade, respectively.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our current grade 10 students will achieve a 5% increase in performance this year to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alondra Beatty (abeatty@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	School wide writing (FSA Rubric) Rigorous grade level instruction Monitor the lowest 25%
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Improving writing across the school will increase student achievement in ELA FSA. Providing grade student access to grade level instruction at the rigor of the standard will increase student achievement. Monitoring the lowest 25% will allow for tiered interventions to occur.
Action Step	
Description	1. Develop writing CFAs and calibrate teachers 2. Implement a school wide monitoring system for writing data by student 3. Monitor instruction using the IPG tool 4. Writing workshops for the 10th grade ELA students
Person Responsible	Alondra Beatty (abeatty@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

NA