

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Strawberry Crest 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	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	19

Strawberry Crest High School

4691 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christina Raburn

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2008

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)	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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (65%)
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	19

Strawberry Crest High School

4691 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[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	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

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 become the district's leader in developing successful students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To Create Responsible Empowered Scholars for Tomorrow (CREST)

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
Brown, David	Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and support PD opportunities.
Ewell, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and PD opportunities.
Raburn, Christina	Assistant Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and reflection of progression toward our goals.
Schwarz, Robin	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson; schedule and oversee SAC meetings
Hobbs, Trent	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee; oversee SIP and it's implementation

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	0	673	626	528	484	2311
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	67	62	74	274
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	25	7	4	48
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	116	75	56	414
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	116	75	56	414

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	45	43	23	14	125

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

86

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/7/2019

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	93	77	62	79	311
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	55	52	59	260
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	161	135	113	460
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	132	98	49	443

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	129	90	76	0	295

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	93	77	62	79	311
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	55	52	59	260
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	161	135	113	460
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	132	98	49	443

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	129	90	76	0	295

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	59%	56%	56%	52%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	54%	51%	51%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	42%	35%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	49%	51%	53%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	60%	48%	48%	49%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	45%	45%	35%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	82%	69%	68%	57%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	75%	73%	76%	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	673 (0)	626 (0)	528 (0)	484 (0)	2311 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	71 (93)	67 (77)	62 (62)	74 (79)	274 (311)
One or more suspensions	12 (94)	25 (55)	7 (52)	4 (59)	48 (260)
Course failure in ELA or Math	167 (51)	116 (161)	75 (135)	56 (113)	414 (460)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	167 (164)	116 (132)	75 (98)	56 (49)	414 (443)

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	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	79%	66%	13%	67%	12%
2018	73%	62%	11%	65%	8%
Compare		6%			

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	74%	73%	1%	70%	4%
2018	78%	70%	8%	68%	10%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	63%	-13%	61%	-11%
2018	46%	63%	-17%	62%	-16%
Compare		4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	57%	8%	57%	8%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	70%	56%	14%	56%	14%
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	16	38	32	24	47	46	8	23		95	22
ELL	12	38	35	39	52	71	41	32		89	34
ASN	96	76		88	92		100	100		100	89
BLK	59	46	15	45	41		68	76		92	58
HSP	43	50	34	52	58	62	71	59		96	51
MUL	86	65		65	75		83	72			
WHT	66	60	50	65	63	65	88	77		95	66
FRL	42	51	36	51	57	56	71	62		93	50
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	15	36	36	38	47	53	39	41		88	33
ELL	8	37	39	46	50	57	30	34		79	39
ASN	93	69		100	87		96	97		100	93
BLK	50	51	38	63	79	70	95	75		97	56
HSP	39	51	43	58	65	72	62	67		91	58
MUL	78	53		73	55		100	90		100	61
WHT	59	60	51	65	63	55	75	84		97	64
FRL	36	49	45	54	60	63	61	66		92	53
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	27	27	14	21	22	11	46		92	24
ELL	6	24	23	23	30	32	11	35		82	29
ASN	96	81		92	87		93	92		100	89
BLK	58	52	44	48	52	26	54	86		93	68
HSP	33	42	34	43	41	37	40	67		92	50
MUL	72	51		70	74		75			100	72
WHT	57	53	37	57	50	34	63	78		97	62
FRL	32	40	34	38	36	31	41	67		93	47

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	710
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	46
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	93
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	56
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	59

Hispanic Students	
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	70
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 showed the lowest performance in 2019; however our school improved by 4% in this area from 2018 to 2019.

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

Math gains showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019; yet, improved by 4% (raw data) over that same time period.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average; -11% vs. -16% in 2018.

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

Biology EOC showed the greatest area of improvement (school and state levels). 12% greater than state (an improvement from 8% above state in 2018).

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

Math gains for all students to include SWD and ELL.
Overall literacy for all students to include SWD and ELL.

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

1. Literacy (specifically improving ELA performance)
2. Decrease the rigor gap
3. Acceleration (increase opportunity for eligible students to obtain acceleration)
4. Community engagement (getting the community involved in SCHS)
5. Professional Development (providing more opportunities for PD that align specifically to school wide instructional priorities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Pass Rates for FSA ELA & Math (Algebra 1 EOC) State Assessments
Rationale	SCHS was 11% points below the state in 2019 in Math, SWD 6% below the Federal Index, and 59% of our students scored a 3.0 or better on the FSA ELA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student achievement will increase 5% on FSA ELA & Math assessments when best teaching practices are embedded in all content areas through rigorous tasks that are aligned with grade level and content area standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christina Raburn (christina.raburn@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Development (providing more opportunities for PD that align specifically to school wide instructional priorities); Monthly AVID/Literacy Coach Professional Development opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach. We train 80,000 educators annually to close the opportunity gap, so they can prepare all students for college, careers, and life. Example of data: First-generation, low-income AVID alumni who go to college are four times more likely to graduate than their national peers.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literacy PD 2. AVID PD 3. Best Practices/Literacy/AVID implementation 4. Data review 5. Communication between stakeholders
Person Responsible	Christina Raburn (christina.raburn@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	Increase SWD Student Achievement
Rationale	Federal Index was 41% and we were at a 35%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD student achievement will increase by 6%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christina Raburn (christina.raburn@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Literacy and AVID professional development/best teaching practices implementation through monthly PD opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach. We train 80,000 educators annually to close the opportunity gap, so they can prepare all students for college, careers, and life. Example of data: First-generation, low-income AVID alumni who go to college are four times more likely to graduate than their national peers.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literacy PD 2. AVID PD 3. Best Practices/Literacy/AVID implementation 4. Data review 5. Communication between stakeholders
Person Responsible	Christina Raburn (christina.raburn@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).

Improved communication with our stakeholders: Edsby, phone calls, parent links, etc...

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, Â§ 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.

N/A

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.

To ensure support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT:

Reviews school-wide data on an ongoing basis, identifying instructional needs across the school; Supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks; Reviews progress monitoring data of core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains; Communicates school-wide data to PLCs, facilitating problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

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.

Title I:

PartA

Funding enriches eligible schools with additional instructional staff, PD, ELP, and supplemental resources for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools.

PartC- Migrant

The migrant advocate provides services and support to students, parents, teachers and other programs to ensure that students' needs are met.

PartD

Funds support the Alternative Education Program, providing transition services from alternative education to school of choice, and includes mentoring, intervention services and educational support using transition specialists, teachers, paras and tutors.

TitleII

Funds for PD to provide/promote high quality professional learning that supports improved job performance for all resulting in increased student achievement.

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.

TitleX- Homeless

Coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunities.

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.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Pass Rates for FSA ELA & Math (Algebra 1 EOC) State Assessments	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase SWD Student Achievement	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00