Steinbrenner High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Ewell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2019

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)	20%
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 (72%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (74%)
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

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	20%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

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.

Steinbrenner High School will be among the top-performing high schools in Florida

Provide the school's vision statement.

Steinbrenner High School will provide a rigorous course of study for students served in all programs

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
King, Kelly	Principal	
Gerhardt, Ben	Assistant Principal	
Clemmons, Holly	Assistant Principal	
Dillon, Calvin	Teacher, K-12	
Puskas, Marie	Teacher, K-12	
Savino, Jaclyn	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	600	649	606	580	2435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	30	40	35	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	18	19	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	67	83	57	236
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	63	34	13	184

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	29	44	41	27	141

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	1	1
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)

173

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
	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	55	35	33	56	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	41	39	59	171
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	64	75	94	272
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	52	25	30	138

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	34	46	38	58	176

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	55	35	33	56	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	41	39	59	171
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	64	75	94	272
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	52	25	30	138

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	34	46	38	58	176

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	80%	56%	56%	74%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	54%	51%	58%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	41%	42%	42%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	73%	49%	51%	73%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	59%	48%	48%	61%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	45%	54%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	85%	69%	68%	85%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	75%	73%	88%	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	600 (0)	649 (0)	606 (0)	580 (0)	2435 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 (55)	30 (35)	40 (33)	35 (56)	138 (179)
One or more suspensions	20 (32)	16 (41)	18 (39)	19 (59)	73 (171)
Course failure in ELA or Math	29 (39)	67 (64)	83 (75)	57 (94)	236 (272)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	74 (31)	63 (52)	34 (25)	13 (30)	184 (138)

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	79%	55%	24%	55%	24%
	2018	77%	53%	24%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	78%	53%	25%	53%	25%
	2018	76%	52%	24%	53%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	84%	66%	18%	67%	17%
2018	82%	62%	20%	65%	17%
Compare		2%			

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	94%	73%	21%	70%	24%
2018	89%	70%	19%	68%	21%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	63%	-3%	61%	-1%
2018	55%	63%	-8%	62%	-7%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	57%	20%	57%	20%
2018	72%	56%	16%	56%	16%
Compare		5%			

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	31	43	44	31	41	47	54	68		89	38
ELL	51	42	50	45	41		57			100	40
ASN	92	67		86	64		100	100		100	85

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
BLK	69	68	56	45	40		67	91		96	28
HSP	76	62	55	69	54	53	85	97		95	57
MUL	90	61		79	79		87	100		100	68
WHT	80	59	51	75	60	52	85	93		96	68
FRL	61	52	46	58	49	48	70	90		89	51

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	25	42	37	32	36	29	39	58		89	13
ELL	45	38	33	45	36	42	52	50		73	
ASN	86	62		73	58		88	86		100	83
BLK	61	54	68	50	43	46	77	77		93	44
HSP	74	58	48	63	47	42	80	85		95	62
MUL	90	61		75	53		95	96		94	67
WHT	79	63	52	74	55	51	84	90		97	61
FRL	63	56	50	55	46	49	71	77		86	45

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	24	28	23	35	37	37	33	60		75	26
ELL	30	31	25	50	44		53	53		84	38
ASN	83	60		84	71		95	92		94	82
BLK	45	38	26	50	44	32	75	63		85	38
HSP	72	57	44	73	61	64	82	84		95	64
MUL	75	71	60	68	54		80	91		85	59
WHT	77	61	44	75	63	55	87	91		95	66
FRL	56	46	34	59	52	49	74	73		85	49

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	71
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	782
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	55
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	87
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	62
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	70
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	83
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	
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	72
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	61
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 learning gains plateaued for the lowest 25% at 52% and decreased schoolwide. The biggest contributing factor is a lack of upward mobility for the top-performing students.

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

The only decline was in schoolwide ELA learning gains. The decline appears to be due to a lack of challenge and rigorous engagement for the top-performing students.

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.

There were no gaps - we exceeded the state average in every category.

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

The biggest improvement was in math learning gains. There was a concentrated focus on vocabulary and writing, which led to higher achievement because so much of the assessments req

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

uire higher level thinking and language processing on the part of the students.

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

1. Collaboration for standards implementation
2. Reading and writing across the content areas
3. Assessment in instruction and planning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Positively impact school culture by providing all students access to academic, social, and emotional support through a diverse system of schoolwide mentoring and student-initiated programs.
Rationale	It is not enough to engage students with rigor in the classroom; they must have their social and emotional needs met and feel supported and resilient at school as well.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We want to increase the 4-year graduate rate for both AT-risk and standard diploma students, and increase the attendance rate and monitor students with a GPA below 2.0. These factors inhibit the potential of these students and addressing their social and emotional needs as well as the academic is essential to educating the whole child.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly King (kellya.king@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of the Warrior M3 Mentoring program coupled with activities related to Start With Hello and other student-run social-emotional programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	THe strategy is an example of effective past practice that we will continue and is an extension of a national program designed to make students feel more supported and connected in schools.

Action Step	
Description	1. Meet with 5-10 students quarterly to monitor how effective mentoring programs are on campus at meeting the social, emotional and academic needs of students. 2. Regular reporting of results of meetings to administration 3. Coordination of Start With Hello programs through the guidance department 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Kelly King (kellya.king@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	Student achievement will increase when students have access to rigorous tasks and assignments aligned with grade-level literacy and content area standards in every classroom.
Rationale	Students are only successful when literacy is supported across all curricula so that they can learn to transfer the skills necessary for success. Lessons must all include rigorous engaging tasks that align with curriculum standards and ensure the students are responsible for their own learning.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the second semester, 80% of students will be college ready in mathematics as measured by state testing, the four year grad rate will be 96.25%, and advanced coursework completion will be 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly King (kellya.king@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ILT and PLC time will be utilized to maximize common assessments and examination of student data to improve instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ILT and PLCs are proven research-based approaches that have been implemented nationally and hare encouraged by the district.
Action Step	
Description	1. Student data will be collected and examined throughout the year to determine achievement or rigorous tasks through the ILT/PLC process. 2. Teachers will collaborate on assessments and lessons resulting from analysis of student performance data, specifically targeting students in Q1 and Q4 to ensure that students are engaged in rigorous tasks in each classroom and are growing and learning, as demonstrated by achieving learning gains, however those are measured in each context. 3. Core ILT and administrative leadership teams will meet to discuss the feedback from ILT/ PLC group meetings, and determine areas of need with respect to teachers' professional development. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Kelly King (kellya.king@hcps.net)

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).

n/a

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

While we are not a Title 1 school, we are blessed with a very active PTSA and parent members of SAC. We have parent volunteers present on campus weekly and amass hundreds of volunteer hours. The parents and students are given a voice in directing school based decisions and implement initiatives related to student safety, wellness, and guidance on more academic endeavors such as standardized test preparation.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
Parent information and/or education opportunities

Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
Campus visits
Shadow days
Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources)

The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar, ensuring opportunities to review assessments, outcome data, and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. Team members include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/ specialists, PLC teacher liaisons, others as needed

TitleII
Funds for PD to provide/promote high quality professional learning that supports improved job performance for all resulting in increased student achievement. PD includes alternative certification, instructional support training and teacher induction program.

TitleIII
Services are provided to ensure ELLs have access to academic content that is equal in scope, sequence, breadth, and depth to the curricular offerings available to all. Services include educational materials and ELL district supported services such as interpreters, translators, bi-lingual support services, teachers, parent involvement and community outreach programs, improving education of immigrant and ELLs.

TitleX- Homeless
Coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunities. Federal funds are "braided" to support supplemental academic resource teachers at district school sites and to support selected professional learning opportunities for teachers.

TitleIV
Funds used provide academic enrichment activities for high-needs students including college and career counseling, STEM, arts, civics, IB/AP. Funds also support safe and healthy students through mental health services, drug and violence prevention and PE. Effective use of classroom technology is supported through PD.

HeadStart
Appropriate assessments identify a child's strengths, interests, needs and learning styles. Schools utilize information from students to transition into kindergarten.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Steinbrenner offers ServSafe certification through the culinary program, personal trainer certification (NASM) through the Athletic Training STEM program, and multiple Microsoft Office certifications through the Career and Technical Education department. Multiple colleges visit the campus throughout the year to discuss characteristics of potential students. Students are also offered opportunities to visit Career and Technical Centers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Positively impact school culture by providing all students access to academic, social, and emotional support through a diverse system of schoolwide mentoring and student-initiated programs.**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Student achievement will increase when students have access to rigorous tasks and assignments aligned with grade-level literacy and content area standards in every classroom.**	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00