

Hernando County School District

Frank W. Springstead 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Frank W. Springstead High School

3300 MARINER BLVD, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/hhs>

Demographics

Principal: Dana Pearce

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	81%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: A (67%)
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 Hernando 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Frank W. Springstead High School

3300 MARINER BLVD, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/hhs>

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	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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 promote an educational environment where students are challenged, successful, and inspired.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Advancing excellence, building community and choosing responsibility.

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
Pearce, Dana	Principal	Evaluations/Oversight: Secretaries, A.Ps., Assessment, AP Coordinator and A.D. Activities: School Approval of; Fundraisers, Master Calendar Request Use of Facilities Chamber of Commerce Student: Graduation, Field Trip Approvals, Yearbook Budget- District and Internal, Athletics, Capital Business Partners Cafeteria Manager Contract Issues- Instructional, Non Instructional HCTA International Baccalaureate Master Schedule News Contact Person, Public Relations Purchasing Oversight Reports: Accreditation, Program Compliance, Audits, Title 9 SBLTs: Admin.(Guidance, Assess., C3), Dept. Heads School Improvement Team (S.I.P.) SRO
Markford, Rick	Assistant Principal	Evaluations: Phys Ed., Fine Arts SBLTs: O.T.L. Disciplines - Rogers-Zuel ISS Oversight Facilities & Custodial Keys/Plant Operations/Inventory Custodial Evaluations Lost/Stolen (school property) Reports: Fire & Safety, FISH, Public Sale, School Activities: 12th grade parent workshop Athletics – Coaches, Sports Student: Homecoming: Bonfire, Fireworks Turn-Around Student School: Calendars, Activities, Spring Orientation (8thGrade), Open House Public Relations & School Information Admin. Morning Announcements Bulletin Boards Blackboard (Global) Calls Soc. Media- Twitter, FBook, Edline Website Bell Schedule Operations Safety & Security- Safe Schools/CrisisGo App. – Coordinator/Liaison Emergency Response Information Portal

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Threat Assessment Team/ Crisis/Care Team Campus/Hallway Security Emergency Drills Transportation
Weaver, John	Assistant Principal	Evaluations/Oversight: CTE, World Languages, ROTC, ESE, Guidance Activities: 11th grade parent workshop School: PD Lead, SREOY Student: Eagle Pride, Hmcmng. (Powder-Puff,), Horror High Attendance/Tardy Oversight Discipline- Abdul-Rahim-Duris Chalk Professional Development MTSS FLEX Assignments and Data Collection Substitutes Duty Schedules (co w/ Sakser) Pit Crew Clubs
Hafliger, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Wright, Brandon	Instructional Coach	Social Sciences Department Co-Chair, Virtual Coaching for Educators
Pusta, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Fine Arts Department Chair
Sweetwine, Darryl	Teacher, K-12	ROTC Department Chair
Imhof, John	Teacher, K-12	Social Sciences Department Co-Chair
Prokop, Jennifer	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Bennett, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Assessment Teacher
DiLorenzo, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Kinsella-Gordon, Grace	Teacher, K-12	CTE Department Chair
Kupcik, Dustin	Teacher, K-12	Athletic Director Physical Education Department Chair

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Altimari, Denise	Teacher, K-12	Reading Department Chair
Sufficool, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Temple, Vickie	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Espinosa, Rosanna	Teacher, K-12	World Languages Department Chair
Buford, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Evaluations/Oversight: Science and Math Activities: 10th grade parent workshop School: S.A.C. Lead, Teacher/Staff Appreciation, TOY, (Shout out, Educator of the Month) Student: Anti-Bullying BlackBoard (Global) Connect (Co w/Markford) Disciplines- Duval-Lenamon E-School/Edgenuity Reports: Restraint/Seclusion to DOE, FTE, SIP, 10-day count End-of-Year Teacher check-out
Sakser, Leslie	Assistant Principal	Evaluations: Reading, ELA, ESOL and Social Sciences Activities: 9th grade parent workshop Assessment/Testing Blue Book - (co w/ Markford) Disciplines- Leon-Rodriguez Dual-Enrollment/PHSC Liaison Media Center Homeroom Student Government Duty Schedules (co w/ Weaver)

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	427	448	400	421	1696
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	6	8	8	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	15	33	37	127
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	
FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	67	66	63	272
FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	0	0	0	63
ALG EOC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	98	47	36	186
GEO EOC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	83	10	99

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	100	105	90	91	386

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)

92

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/6/2019

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	124	13	24	34	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	83	113	40	271
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	59	98	89	268
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	100	91	41	352

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	105	141	153	97	496

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	124	13	24	34	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	83	113	40	271
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	59	98	89	268
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	100	91	41	352

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	105	141	153	97	496

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	61%	49%	56%	47%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	45%	51%	49%	43%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	36%	42%	42%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	51%	51%	55%	49%	49%
Math Learning Gains	47%	45%	48%	43%	40%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	38%	45%	31%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	82%	68%	68%	74%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	71%	73%	81%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	427 (0)	448 (0)	400 (0)	421 (0)	1696 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	29 (124)	6 (13)	8 (24)	8 (34)	51 (195)
One or more suspensions	42 (35)	15 (83)	33 (113)	37 (40)	127 (271)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (22)	0 (59)	0 (98)	0 (89)	0 (268)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (120)	0 (100)	0 (91)	0 (41)	0 (352)
FSA ELA	76 (0)	67 (0)	66 (0)	63 (0)	272 (0)
FSA MATH	63 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	63 (0)
ALG EOC	5 (0)	98 (0)	47 (0)	36 (0)	186 (0)
GEO EOC	0 (0)	6 (0)	83 (0)	10 (0)	99 (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	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

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	78%	67%	11%	67%	11%
2018	64%	58%	6%	65%	-1%
Compare		14%			

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	76%	70%	6%	70%	6%
2018	75%	68%	7%	68%	7%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	59%	-16%	61%	-18%
2018	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%
2018	51%	45%	6%	56%	-5%
Compare		8%			

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	24	42	32	31	46	46	42	71		76	23
ELL	34	48	39	30	42	39	25	46		89	53
ASN	73	57		82	60		86			100	73
BLK	35	40	33	38	42	47	55	64		88	64
HSP	51	52	52	43	46	37	71	70		85	56
MUL	65	56		73	54		100			93	71
WHT	66	55	47	61	48	41	87	84		89	62
FRL	52	51	48	48	45	41	75	70		87	52

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	31	52	50	25	38	33	43	47		64	13
ELL	23	33	36	23	43	39	42	43		54	
ASN	92	71									
BLK	35	45	27	26	35	40	40	85		96	43
HSP	49	49	38	42	48	40	62	70		84	58
MUL	65	57		56	57		72	88		81	62
WHT	61	61	55	56	50	41	67	78		90	63
FRL	51	53	42	46	48	38	61	75		87	58

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	12	30	25	22	44	41	25	69		57	38
ELL	6	32	26	26	29	26	40	53		50	
ASN	88	63		77	59		100				
BLK	43	57	40	38	32	27	56	62		93	69
HSP	40	46	38	51	39	20	72	80		84	64
MUL	43	59		38	28	45				91	70

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
WHT	48	48	43	57	45	33	75	81		88	67
FRL	39	47	41	46	38	28	67	80		80	63

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	60
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	658
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

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	44
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
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	55
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	73
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	64
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	55
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.

Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in Mathematics showed the lowest performance at only 40%. Some of the contributing factors include attendance and behavior issues.

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

Learning Gains in ELA showed the greatest decline with a decrease from 57% to 53%. Some of the contributing factors include teacher turnover in the English Department and behavior issues.

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.

Science (Biology) Achievement shows the biggest gap when compared to state averages with a gap of 15% from 82% (SHS) to 67% (state). Some of the contributing factors include teaching strategies and changing schedules, allowing students with lower achievement levels (1 and 2) to enroll in Environmental Science in 9th grade. This gives students an extra year of scaffolding science content to better prepare them for the Achievement Testing.

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

Science (Biology) Achievement showed the most improvement with an increase from 66% to 82%. Some of the actions include teaching strategies and changing schedules, allowing students with lower achievement levels (1 and 2) to enroll in Environmental Science in 9th grade. This gives students an extra year of scaffolding science content to better prepare them for the Achievement Testing.

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

Learning Gains for all students in all areas is one potential area of concern. The amount of students scoring Level 1 on Algebra EOC and Geometry EOC is another potential area of concern.

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

1. Increase Graduation Rate
2. Increase Learning Gains in ELA and Math
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Learning Gains
Rationale	Based on the School Grade Data, ELA Learning Gains dropped from 57% to 53%. Based on the School Grade Data, Math Learning Gains dropped from 49% to 47%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA Learning Gains will increase by at least 5 percentage points to at least 58%. Math Learning Gains will increase by at least 3 percentage points to at least 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dana Pearce (pearce_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Progress Monitoring using Formative Assessments in Core Content Areas throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress Monitoring is the selected strategy because of the immediate feedback for teachers and students. Progress Monitoring will be implemented by classroom teachers based on formative data using programs such as Achieve 3000 and ALEKS, as well as teacher-created formatives. Teachers will collect and reflect upon data and determine the next steps based on Best Practices to increase student learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content Based Programs (Achieve 3000, ALEKS) 2. Teacher-created Formatives 3. Monthly Data Chats (Student/Teacher; Student/Administration; and Teacher/Administration) 4. Differentiation in Lesson Plans 5. Utilizing District Academic Coaches 6. Celebrating Student Growth 7. Professional Development (to address learning strategies that will allow teachers to meet all students' needs) 8. Take Two Mentoring Program 9. FLEX Time (to address specific needs of students) 10. PIT Crew
Person Responsible	Dana Pearce (pearce_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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