Polk County Public Schools

Hospital Homebound

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hospital Homebound

1909 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Carr

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Polk 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

Hospital Homebound

1909 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

[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)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The mission of the Hospital Homebound Program is to provide eligible students with the materials and specialized instruction necessary to support progress toward graduation requirements.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of hospital homebound is creating an environment that establishes opportunities for hospital or homebound students to be college, career and community ready for life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Deron	Principal	The School Leader will identify programs needs and resources (both material, instructional and personnel) that will best support each student and their teachers.
Carr, Lisa	Other	Senior Manager of Hospital Homebound Coordinates and oversees the operations of the Hospital Housebound Program including the 17 Full time Staff Members and approximately 123 Part time Teachers. Collaborates with families, Doctors, and school sites to place the student in the least restrictive setting to continue their educational path towards graduation while enrolled in the Hospital Home bound Program. Maintains open communication at all times between students, families, teachers and medical personnel. Develops an individual schedule for each student taking into account their accommodations as indicated on their Individual Education Plan. Coordinates the school-wide testing program.Monitors and maintains grades and attendance for all enrolled students with a special focus on students with extra risk factors to consider. Addresses individual student needs regarding academic options such as virtual, teleclass or field programs. Supports staff with ongoing Professional Development and implementation of new technological programs. Work with teachers on increasing the rigor in our classes and meeting the needs of all levels of learners.

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	5	5	5	14	11	3	13	13	25	14	12	18	28	166
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	7	3	3	4	6	32
One or more suspensions	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	1	1	5	5	5	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	5	7	2	2	3	2	28

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	4	5	4	13	10	3	12	13	23	10	11	14	25	147

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	1	2	1	2	3	4	6	0	3	1	4	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4

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

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	4	13	7	2	8	12	18	9	9	12	23	122

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	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	5 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	14 (0)	11 (0)	3 (0)	13 (0)	13 (0)	25 (0)	14 (0)	12 (0)	18 (0)	28 (0)	166 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	2 ()	1 ()	0 ()	1 ()	2 ()	2 ()	0 ()	7 ()	3 ()	3 ()	4 ()	6 ()	32 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	17 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	28 (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
03	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	48%	-48%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	47%	-47%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	42%	-42%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	73%	45%	28%	55%	18%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		73%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
10	2019	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	56%	-56%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	39%	-39%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	35%	-35%	46%	-46%
	2018	18%	34%	-16%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	41%	-41%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	54%	-14%	67%	-27%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	65%	-65%
Compare		40%			

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	50%	-42%	61%	-53%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	46	27		22							
HSP	50										
WHT	45			18							
FRL	40			27							

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

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	101
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	64%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50

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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	32
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

The Civics data seems to be the most dramatic difference among the other assessments. According to our records and NGSSS Report, we had 5 students take the Civics EOC and of the 5 students, 3 achieved a score of 3 or higher. However, this data is not showing in the Grade Level Data. A factor that contributes to this lower performance is the lack of online accessibility of resources by some students and shows the need for more resources for teachers of the Civics Curriculum. A major contributing factor is the amount of time the students are in the program as enrollment changes daily based upon the student needs.

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

This past year would be the baseline since there was not a SIP in previous years for Hospital Home Bound. However, looking at District trends it would appear that the areas of Algebra 1 EOC, Biology, and Civics all show a decrease in proficiency. Task alignment would be a problem identification that should be considered when designing lesson plans. Planning must be focused on the end being the FSA requirements and standard mastery. The fact of students entering our program at anytime throughout the year with many having already missed a great deal of school time and then again exiting before the end of the school year does not allow for continued learning of the curriculum standards.

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.

Both US History EOC and Biology EOC show a -13% from the state levels. District US History stayed the same as 2018 at 57% and the District Biology EOC -5% from 2018. The District has changed the science course progression to address the complexity of the Biology text so that students should be on a higher reading level when they are taking the Biology EOC. Students in the Hospital Home bound Program are entering at different times throughout the year and with varying educational backgrounds. Many of our student due to medical conditions have not mastered

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

Our 9th grade ELA EOC was 73% compared to 45% District and 55% State. The intentional crossover in curriculum between our English 1 and Reading classes appears to have reinforced the student's skills to show mastery. Eleven 9th graders tested FSA ELA and 8 achieved a Level 3 or above.

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

Our EWS data shows that grade 3 and 8 contain the most students that have been previously retained.
The 8th grade also showed the students with the most EWS indicators.

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

1. Higher student participation in testing
2. Improve student attendance and participation in teleclass courses
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Provide comprehensive educational services to student determined eligible for the Hospital Home Bound Program.
Rationale	Rule 6A-6.03020, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), identifies a HH student as a student who has a medically diagnosed physical or psychiatric condition that is acute or catastrophic in nature, or a chronic illness, or a repeated intermittent illness due to a persisting medical problem. The condition or illness must confine the student to home or hospital and restrict activities for an extended period of time. The possibility of HH services should be explored when it is anticipated that a student will be absent from school for at least 15 school days, while under a physician's care because of severe, prolonged, or chronic illness.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student will successfully complete coursework based upon the Individualized Education Plant that enables them to follow the Pupil Progression Plan for their assigned grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Carr (lisa.carr@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Review of scheduled course grades at interim time and end of each marking period. If student is not passing a course contact the student/ family and determine barriers. If additional assistance is needed via one -on-one instructional support or course scheduling adjustments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Upon early intervention and review the HH student will have a greater chance at academic success in a course. Due to the mobility of HH students in and out of our program monitoring of the student's academic success is essential.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review physician's medical referral for Hospital Home bound Eligibility purposes 2. Review student;s academic records. 3. Assign course schedule and service delivery model based upon the student's medical condition and IEP. 4. Progress monitor student progress at specific times during the year. (interim and end of semester) 5. Modify student schedules or delivery model if evidence is presenting that current plan is not enabling the student to be successful. (Via IEP Ammendment)
Person Responsible	Lisa Carr (lisa.carr@polk-fl.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).

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.

Even though the Hospital Home Bound Program does not receive Title I funding as a source we do have an open door policy with our students. We try to have all Tele Class students staffed at our main location so they can personally meet face to face with each of their teacher before they begin in the program. Throughout the year we meet several times with our families for IEP meetings,to exchange materials and for testing sessions.

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.

All students who are staffed into the Hospital Home Bound Program are determined to be ESE students and based upon needs may receive other services according to their IEP.

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

Each student has an IEP meeting upon entry and dismissal of Hospital Home Bound Services. The parents, students, teachers and other shareholders are invited to all meetings.

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.

The district has aligned curriculum for all populations for Hospital Home bound programs to foster inclusive practices to ensure FAPE. Students are provided instruction on their level of social emotional development and run concurrent with district curriculum maps so that skills are ascertained prior to returning to their home schools Attendance is monitored on a weekly basis and intervention meetings are scheduled as needed..

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

Hospital Home bound students are given information on all Transition Services, Vocational Rehab,and other agencies that could provide assistance. Families are also encourages to stay in continual contact with the counselor at the student's home zoned school for school events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Provide comprehensive educational services to student determined eligible for the Hospital Home Bound Program.	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00