

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tampa Bay Tech 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	15
Budget to Support Goals	18

Tampa Bay Tech High School

6410 ORIENT RD, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ernestine Woody

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (69%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	18

Tampa Bay Tech High School

6410 ORIENT RD, Tampa, FL 33610

[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	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

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

Tampa Bay Technical High School will maintain the highest standards of excellence for all students as they acquire career and academic knowledge to become life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tampa Bay Technical High School will provide a caring and educationally rigorous experience to develop successful students.

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
Ippolito, Michael	Principal	The Principal manages the operations of the school. Mr. Ippolito is responsible for ensuring the school runs smoothly, remains safe, and provides an excellent learning environment for its students.
Woody, Ernestine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
carmody, marissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Athletics and Facilities
Graff-McPherren, Shea	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
ChatmanJohnson, Candace	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs
Conte, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs

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	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	0

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

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

105

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0

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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	65%	56%	56%	57%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	54%	51%	51%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	41%	42%	47%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	61%	49%	51%	50%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	48%	48%	43%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	45%	28%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	77%	69%	68%	70%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	75%	73%	78%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	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)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	63%	53%	10%	53%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	52%	6%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	77%	66%	11%	67%	10%
2018	71%	62%	9%	65%	6%
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	81%	73%	8%	70%	11%
2018	75%	70%	5%	68%	7%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	63%	-20%	61%	-18%
2018	36%	63%	-27%	62%	-26%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	57%	10%	57%	10%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	54%	56%	-2%	56%	-2%
Compare		13%			

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	22	32	32	48	59		44	69		100	61
ELL	48	62	60	58	54	55	59	50		100	67
ASN	88	62		89	44		94	91		100	83
BLK	55	53	51	51	49	41	70	78		100	69
HSP	73	67	63	69	57	61	81	79		100	77
MUL	71	60		74	69		85	79		100	91
WHT	74	63	46	71	59	50	88	90		95	69
FRL	62	57	51	58	52	45	74	78		99	70
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	20	31	40	32	33	36	39	38		100	42
ELL	33	43	55	45	32	27	61	36		100	73
ASN	83	68		94	64		100	90		100	95
BLK	52	50	45	37	37	30	65	69		97	58
HSP	66	54	50	60	48	22	76	78		98	73
MUL	67	48		64	64		90	71		100	67
WHT	78	63	60	72	60	75	79	85		96	80
FRL	57	51	46	48	43	31	70	72		97	65
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	36	37	20	21	12	46	47		92	36
ELL	24	39	44	39	41	24	39	47		91	69
AMI	82	64									
ASN	80	60		87	59		95	93		94	94
BLK	51	48	42	42	40	28	63	74		96	48
HSP	57	49	49	55	43	26	71	77		94	60
MUL	73	68	70	49	53	24	68	79		88	53
WHT	70	60	52	58	47	39	87	87		97	63
FRL	55	50	46	47	41	28	66	74		95	52

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	68
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	753
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	63
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	81
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	73

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	79
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	71
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	66
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.

Students with disabilities had the lowest ELA achievement than their white counterparts. This was also evident in their ELA Learning Gains. These students need additional support in English and Reading.

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

Student Data demonstrates that there were gains in all categories in comparison to the previous year. The school made greater efforts to focus on standards based learning objectives. Teachers made sure students are aware of the learning objective and can express it verbally. The learning objective is posted on the board and students can explain how it connects to what they have been doing in

class. The teachers created lesson plans with the standard in mind and reflected the objective for the lesson.

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.

Tampa Bay Tech's students showed the greatest gap in the lowest 25th percentile in Math in comparison to the state. Algebra 1 students struggled, however additional tutoring services will be offered this year.

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

Students showed great improvement on the Algebra EOC. Students received additional support through tutoring and enrichment.

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

Our two areas of concern are SWD and Black students in ELA. In order to close the achievement gap, it is imperative that we further provide additional support for our SWD and Black students.

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

1. SWD ELA Achievement
2. SWD ELA Learning Gains
3. SWD Math Achievement
4. Black Students ELA Achievement
5. Black Students Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	SWD in ELA
Rationale	SWD scored the lowest percentage points in ELA. We will provide additional support for these students through Reading and English classes. Students will also receive additional tutoring services.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to improve 3 to 5 additional percentage points in the category for SWD students in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ernestine Woody (ernestine.woody@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will include writing across all contents with a focus on claim, commentary, and evidence. Teachers will use FSA ELA Writing Rubric that differentiates between evidence and commentary. Teachers will create lesson plans with daily practice of claim, commentary, and evidence (examples include quick writes, exit slips, bellwork, etc)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Comprehension strategies are conscious plans, sets of steps that good readers use to make sense of text. Comprehension strategy instruction helps students become purposeful, active readers who are in control of their own reading comprehension. These strategies have research-based evidence for improving text comprehension.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will meet weekly with department head. 2. Teachers will meet with their PLC team weekly. 3. Teachers will monitor student achievement weekly 4. Parents will receive updated EDSBY reports. 5. Students will receive tutoring and enrichment opportunities.
Person Responsible	Shea Graff-McPherren (shea.graff-mcpherren@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).

Writing across all contents with a focus on claim, commentary, and evidenceTeacher uses FSA ELA Writing Rubric that differentiates between evidence and commentary
 Teacher creates lesson plan with daily practice of claim, commentary, and evidence (examples include quick writes, exit slips, bellwork, 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.

Support for family and community involvement begins with TBT's school administrators. TBT administrators willingness to recruit parents and community members for school tasks, to listen to other people's viewpoints, and to share decision making provides a necessary foundation for all school-family community partnerships. Communication is an important part of our building and sustaining community relationships. Tampa Bay Tech communicates with parents and our community through: written communication (via website, electronic and paper newsletter and Edsby) telephone communication (Parent Link, personal teacher calls) and parent-teacher conferences (formally each quarter or informally through appointments). In addition PTSA supports parents, teachers, and students through various events such as Donuts for Dad, Muffins for Mom, academic and attendance incentives, and Conference Nights.

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). An annual inventory of resource materials, staff, and funds allocated determines necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet student needs through a resource map.

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).

PartC- Migrant

The migrant advocate provides services and support to students, parents, teachers and other programs to ensure that students' needs are met. Supplementary services include identification and recruitment, advocacy, health/social services, academic support, parental involvement and family literacy.

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.

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.

The school encourages students to take AP and Dual enrollment classes. In addition, students went on field trips to potential job sites several times throughout the year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD in ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00