Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sickles High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sickles High School

7950 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Krista Luloff

Start Date for this Principal: 5/5/2024

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
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: A (67%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Sickles High School

[no web address on file]

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	No	37%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an education and the supports that enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students for life.

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
Freitas, Mary	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	637	645	577	598	2457
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	57	32	38	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	10	11	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	60	42	36	161
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	26	73	45	46	190

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)
108

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/24/2019

Prior Year - 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	62	47	69	83	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	69	57	221
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	58	78	87	271
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	73	68	31	247

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	50	57	71	64	242

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	62	47	69	83	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	69	57	221
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	58	78	87	271
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	73	68	31	247

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	50	57	71	64	242

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	73%	56%	56%	67%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	51%	61%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	41%	42%	50%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	64%	49%	51%	72%	51%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	57%	48%	48%	66%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	45%	49%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	69%	68%	68%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	75%	73%	86%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	637 (0)	645 (0)	577 (0)	598 (0)	2457 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	23 (62)	57 (47)	32 (69)	38 (83)	150 (261)
One or more suspensions	6 (52)	14 (43)	10 (69)	11 (57)	41 (221)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (48)	60 (58)	42 (78)	36 (87)	161 (271)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (75)	0 (73)	0 (68)	0 (31)	0 (247)

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	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%
	2018	68%	53%	15%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	53%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	82%	66%	16%	67%	15%
2018	72%	62%	10%	65%	7%
Compare		10%			

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	84%	73%	11%	70%	14%
2018	89%	70%	19%	68%	21%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	63%	-11%	61%	-9%
2018	46%	63%	-17%	62%	-16%
Compare		6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	57%	10%	57%	10%
2018	68%	56%	12%	56%	12%
Compare		-1%			

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	35	46	29	33	40	31	46	70		76	24
ELL	34	53	47	45	49	39	57	55		95	49
ASN	83	69		88	73		95	91		91	87
BLK	46	50	45	38	44	27	53	68		97	43
HSP	61	58	46	53	53	41	76	78		94	48
MUL	81	58		69	50		96	87		86	63
WHT	82	70	58	75	61	43	88	93		97	63
FRL	54	57	46	49	53	35	74	78		93	46

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	38	42	38	31	31	51		84	15
ELL	30	47	45	40	53	39	49	75		92	40
ASN	82	64	45	81	53		84	100		100	67
BLK	45	37	21	62	56	30	52	82		96	47
HSP	57	63	61	52	49	41	62	86		95	48
MUL	69	59	50	56	52		71	95		100	55
WHT	78	63	49	71	53	41	81	92		95	61
FRL	52	53	52	48	46	36	57	82		95	44
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	28	43	43	42	51	35	37	64		67	29
ELL	20	45	43	46	58	39	29	59		74	31
ASN	85	85		90	79		88	93		100	83
BLK	59	53	27	67	65	50	57	89		82	43
HSP	54	53	46	63	61	45	57	78		87	52
MUL	69	50		82	81		70	89		90	62
WHT	77	67	61	76	67	52	77	91		91	59
FRL	47	51	45	58	62	46	51	77		79	39

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	728
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
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	51
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	60
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	74
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	73
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	58
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.

- Algebra EOC at 52% showed the lowest performance for 2019
- Contributing Factors: low performing students; student with limited math skills coming from 8th grade
- Trends: still top-performing schools in the district

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

- History EOC showed the greatest decline from the prior year (-5%)
- Contributing Factors: change in staff members teaching the course

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.

- Algebra EOC, at -9% below the state average, had the greatest (negative) gap between our school and the state. On the positive end of the spectrum, the ELA, at +17% above the state average, had the greatest positive gap between our school and the state.
- Contributing Factors: Regarding algebra, the strongest students take Algebra in 8th grade.
- Trends: n/a

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

- Biology EOC, with a 10% increase from last year, showed the most improvement.. This is due to increase in standards-based lessons, common assessment, and PLC time.

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

Bottom quartile and at-risk seniors

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

1. Getting our lowest 25% to increase learning gains in ELA and Math
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Bottom Quartile ELA & Math Scores & Learning Gains
Rationale	These students were our lowest-performing group and are counted twice in school grade: bottom quartile and learning gains

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our bottom quartile pass rate by 2% and learning gains by 2%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gregory Lewandowski (gregory.lewandowski@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-based, data-driven lesson planning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using the formative and summative assessment data (group and individualized) when used to inform instruction has been shown to improve student performance and increase student achievement.

Action Step

Description	1. PLCs will meet to plan common lessons and assessments (standards-based) including strategies to move bottom quartile students 2. PLCs will analyze common assessment data 3. PLCs will respond to the assessment data appropriately
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Bottom Quartile ELA & Math Scores & Learning Gains	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**