Haines City Senior High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Haines City Senior High School

2800 HORNET DR, Haines City, FL 33844

http://www.hainescityhighschool.com/

Demographics

Principal: Brad Tarver

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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

Haines City Senior High School

2800 HORNET DR, Haines City, FL 33844

http://www.hainescityhighschool.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	89%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

Haines City High School provides a high-quality education by forging strong communal relationships, achieving academic proficiency, and reinforcing positive behavior. Through these provisions, Haines City High School creates Hornet Nation, which is a sense of pride; a feeling of comfort and confidence; a common ground; and a connection felt between students, faculty, parents, and community members.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Mission
Haines City High School's PBIS team promotes a high-quality learning environment for the students and staff by teaching, modeling, and reinforcing positive behavior.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students of Hornet Nation will serve as productive and responsible citizens and be prepared to enter the work force, the military, or a post-secondary institution upon graduation.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lane, Adam	Principal	
McDaniel, Alfonso	Assistant Principal	
Riviere, Hayley	Instructional Coach	
Shick, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Young, Crystal	Assistant Principal	
Reyes, Igdelia	Other	
Rios, Christina	Assistant Principal	
	Assistant Principal	APII, oversees electives and academies

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Brad Tarver

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

124

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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](#).

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	729	679	567	512	2487
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	105	87	85	375
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	54	46	37	256
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	59	41	1	192
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	42	41	3	146
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	202	148	137	674
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	86	230	76	569

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	223	130	176	106	635

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	125	122	85	105	437
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	13	22	77

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	813	658	633	500	2604
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	105	118	124	509
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	83	97	37	352
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	263	239	271	161	934

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	148	88	99	58	393

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	128	104	114	74	420
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	24	29	15	89

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	813	658	633	500	2604
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	105	118	124	509
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	83	97	37	352
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	263	239	271	161	934

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	148	88	99	58	393

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	128	104	114	74	420
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	24	29	15	89

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	41%	47%	56%	36%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	46%	51%	32%	41%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	37%	42%	23%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	29%	43%	51%	29%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	35%	45%	48%	34%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	44%	45%	34%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	50%	58%	68%	51%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	61%	73%	56%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	40%	45%	-5%	55%	-15%
	2018	34%	43%	-9%	53%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	39%	42%	-3%	53%	-14%
	2018	35%	42%	-7%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

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	48%	54%	-6%	67%	-19%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	69%	59%	10%	65%	4%
Compare		-21%			

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	54%	57%	-3%	70%	-16%
2018	60%	57%	3%	68%	-8%
Compare		-6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	50%	-32%	61%	-43%
2018	31%	60%	-29%	62%	-31%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	53%	-19%	57%	-23%
2018	25%	41%	-16%	56%	-31%
Compare		9%			

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	21	34	30	19	28	40	31	45		63	26
ELL	11	35	36	17	36	47	23	28		73	34
AMI	50									80	
ASN	84	59		60			91	92		91	85
BLK	38	44	33	22	29	32	43	48		81	45
HSP	39	48	36	26	33	34	44	52		85	42
MUL	28	24		27			60				
WHT	48	46	34	49	44	50	74	78		81	60
FRL	36	43	35	25	32	33	43	50		82	44

| 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	26	25	27	52	52	48	37		47	14
ELL	8	29	34	23	42	45	68	33		55	48
ASN	69	72		38	33		82			92	83
BLK	35	42	41	24	34	38	62	57		68	32
HSP	31	36	30	33	41	40	78	63		79	54
MUL	25	21						73			
WHT	52	47	38	36	41	60	76	75		77	45
FRL	34	38	34	32	39	41	74	62		76	49

| 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	6	18	20	8	22	35	14	26		46	24
ELL	7	21	23	13	33	36	23	24		55	44
ASN	80	53		62	32		100	77		93	93
BLK	27	28	20	22	33	31	40	51		79	41
HSP	33	31	27	28	32	34	49	52		69	51
MUL	80	60		26	32			50			
WHT	48	32	14	40	40	55	60	74		78	43
FRL	27	29	24	23	31	32	41	51		73	43

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	65
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Math was our lowest achieving area. All subgroups decreased in their math proficiency from the previous school year. Consistent staffing in the math department was an issue, as well as consistency in instruction among the math department.

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

Math was our area of greatest decline. All subgroups decreased in their math proficiency from the previous school year. Consistent staffing in the math department was an issue, as well as consistency in instruction among the math department.

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.

Math was our data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average. All subgroups decreased in their math proficiency from the previous school year. Consistent staffing in the math department was an issue, as well as consistency in instruction among the math department.

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

English data was our area of most improvement. More focus was placed on target-task alignment during common planning, and the teachers had computer carts in their classrooms consistently throughout the year, which allowed their students to practice computer-based assessments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our greatest area of concern is student attendance, followed by discipline incidents among 9th graders.

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

1. Algebra FSA scores
2. English FSA scores
3. Biology EOC scores
4. student attendance
5. 9th grade discipline incidents

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the past two years of state assessment data, our ELL subgroup ESS score has been below 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	LY students will increase 3 points on ELA and/or Algebra state assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Hayley Riviere (hayley.riviere@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESOL para educators will be providing classroom supports in all tested subjects. Students who no longer qualify for intensive ESOL services will be moved to the monitoring stage of the ESOL program based on teacher input and WIDA data, when available. Literacy Coach and Department Chairs will attend LSI and AVID conferences and trainings throughout the year to ensure rigor and supports are built into instructional plans. ESOL students will be encouraged to attend college visitation field trips. This will allow students to visualize different possibilities for their life after high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and students have requested additional ESOL supports outside English and Reading. This year, we are able to secure the funding to address these needs Our Reading ESOL teacher speaks multiple languages, so we are able to reallocated 2 ESOL paras to other disciplines; we were awarded two additional ESOL paras from the district; we were able to use additional Title I funds to add a 5th ESOL para. As of December 2019, we were awarded two additional ESOL teacher units. This allows us to increase our English ESOL support to accommodate our growing population, as well as more intensely support ESOL students in Algebra I. By visiting various local colleges and universities, students will be more driven to accomplish their academic goals to achieve higher opportunities than what they were initially aware were available to them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. perform classroom needs-assessment
2. create fluid support-staff (teacher and para) schedules to support student needs
3. Literacy Coach offers professional development and collaborative planning opportunities to build capacity between content and language teachers
4. monitor achievement data for progress
5. exit qualifying students in a timely manner
6. document ESOL supports for compliance and communication
7. provide collaborative planning throughout the year/summer to create and monitor literacy support
8. provide extended learning opportunities throughout the year for all core content areas
*additional supports
media para provides extra literacy support and helps locate resources
network para ensures laptop carts are delivered on time when applicable
computer lab para keeps track of, administers, and ensures language accommodation materials are delivered to appropriate computer lab locations & cares-for instructional technology
behavior interventionist and guidance counselors provide support for social/emotional learning during LY student's transition periods
outreach facilitator tracks/alerts parents about waning student attendance

Person Responsible	Hayley Riviere (hayley.riviere@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD subgroup ESSA score has been below 41% for the past two years of state assessment data.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD students will increase 3 points on ELA or Math state exams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alfonso McDaniel (alfonso.mcdanieljr@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are refining our support facilitation model as we complete our transition from a consultation model. This will also refining curriculum and strategies used in our Learning Strategies class. This course is an elective for those with SWD who are identified as needing extra support in their IEP. Instructional Coach and Department Chairs will attend LSI and AVID trainings throughout the year to ensure rigor and supports are built into instructional plans. ESE students will be encouraged to attend college visitation field trips. This will allow students to visualize different possibilities for their life after high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The consult model provided limited time for ESE teachers to have enough impact on their students and to provide the support when it was most beneficial. This was reflect in the students' grades and test scores. By visiting various local colleges and universities, students will be more driven to accomplish their academic goals to achieve higher opportunities than what they were initially aware were available to them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. IEPs were revised to address student academic, behavioral, and independent functioning needs (Learning Strats)
2. ESE worked with guidance to schedule the students appropriately, in the least restrictive environment
3. Students on track for an Access point diploma are participating in gen ed electives to provide a more inclusive learning environment
4. Consult teachers were given schedules to push into core classes to provide academic support
5. Consult teachers were given schedules to teach Learning Strategies
6. provide collaborative planning throughout the year to create and monitory literacy support for subgroups
7. provide extended learning opportunities throughout the school year and summer for all core content areas
*additional supports
media para provides locates lexile-appropriate resources
network para keeps track of, replaces with new, and ensures laptop carts are delivered (laptops/carts are also used to provide accommodations)
behavior interventionist and guidance counselors provide support for social/emotional learning during transition periods

Person Responsible	Alfonso McDaniel (alfonso.mcdanieljr@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our multiracial subgroup ESSA data score for the past two years of state assessment data has been below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:	Multiracial students will increase 3 points on the ELA or Math state exams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Igdelia Reyes (igdelia.reyes@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Multiracial students will have regular check-in meetings with our school's success coaches. This will include checking grades, registering for the ACT/SAT, monitoring absences, and reflecting on progress. Instructional Coach and Department Chairs will attend LSI and AVID trainings throughout the year to ensure rigor and supports are built into instructional plans. Multiracial students will be encouraged to attend college visitation field trips. This will allow students to visualize different possibilities for their life after high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These students are one of our school's smallest subgroups and often get over looked for larger demographics. Therefore, providing them with intentional, targeted support will insure they do not fall through the cracks. By visiting various local colleges and universities, students will be more driven to accomplish their academic goals to achieve higher opportunities than what they were initially aware were available to them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. identify students
2. divide by 9/10 and 11/12 grade students between the two success coaches
3. meet with each student once per 4.5 weeks (interim and report card)
4. success coaches will monitor progress and provide resources while students reflect
5. provide collaborative planning throughout the year to create and monitory literacy support for subgroups
6. provide extended learning opportunities throughout the school year and summer for all core content areas
*additional supports
media para provides extra literacy support and helps locate resources
network para keeps track of, replaces with new, and ensures laptop carts are delivered
behavior interventionist and guidance counselors provide support for social/emotional learning during transition periods

Person Responsible	Igdelia Reyes (igdelia.reyes@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Improve ELA FSA scores by 3 points
Improve Algebra I EOC scores by 5 points
Improve Geometry EOC scores by 3 points

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Before any major change is made on campus, teachers are polled for their opinions, and the issue is also brought before our SAC. All parties must be in agreement for the change to occur. Students are also listened to when they vocalize something they would like to see change. The students are polled, which is then brought before the admin team, teachers, and SAC.

Local churches help advertise school events, such as our Title I College and Career Night, and local businesses are invited to attend our SAC committee meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00