Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ami Kids Yes



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
1 Ooitivo Gaitaro & Errynormiont	10
Budget to Support Goals	17

Ami Kids Yes

4337 SAFFOLD RD, Wimauma, FL 33598

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cornelius Bobo

Start Date for this Principal: 9/2/2020

Closed: 2023-07-31				
High School 6-12				
Alternative Education				
No				
100%				
2018-19: No Grade				
2017-18: No Grade				
2016-17: No Grade				
2015-16: No Grade				
Central				
Lucinda Thompson				
N/A				
CS&I				
mation, <u>click here</u> .				

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Ami Kids Yes

4337 SAFFOLD RD, Wimauma, FL 33598

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served		2019-20 Economically
- -	2019-20 Title I School	Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(per MSID File)		(as reported on Survey 3)

High School 6-12

No

%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

AMIkids is a non-profit organization dedicated to helping troubled youth develop into responsible and productive citizens. AMIkids' mission is to protect the public safety and positively impact as many youth as possible through the efforts of a diverse and innovative team. AMIkids works in partnership with youth agencies, local communities and families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AMIkids offers a wide variety of programs and models designed to address youth issues on an individual basis. All of our programs implement the AMIkids Personal Growth Model to separate their troubled past from a bright future. AMIkids guiding principles are based on kids first, family and safety.

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
Wood, Earnest	Principal	AMIKids-YES Carla Foord Director of Education Oversee academic programs at all DJJ sites. Theoron Smith ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL Caleb Bates ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL Kelly Pettingill ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL Joanne Brabham GUIDANCE Lynette Judge SOCIAL WORKER Ricardo Neblett SAL SOCIAL STUDIES Karla Hart SAL ELA Eric Petro SAL SCIENCE Nicole Rizzo ESE SPECIALIST Henry Marcet ESE SPECIALIST
Franklin, Matthew	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/2/2020, Cornelius Bobo

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.

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

3

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-07-31
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Educatio
2019-20 Title I School	No
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)	
	2018-19: No Grade
	2017-18: No Grade
School Grades History	2016-17: No Grade
	2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information	*
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
	CS&I

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator		Grade Level												
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	4	24
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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														
	indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
	Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	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	
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												
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						Gr	ade	Le	ve	l				Total
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator						G	rad	e L	eve	I				Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	16	10	4	54
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	1	1	1	1	0	4

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

Indicator		Grade Level											Total	
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	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).

Sahaal Grada Companant		2019		2018				
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	52%	53%		
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	50%	49%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	42%	0%	39%	41%		
Math Achievement	0%	49%	51%	0%	51%	49%		
Math Learning Gains	0%	48%	48%	0%	47%	44%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	45%	0%	38%	39%		
Science Achievement	0%	69%	68%	0%	62%	65%		
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	73%	0%	74%	70%		

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey												
Indicator		Gra	ade Level	l (prior ye	ar repor	ted)		Total				
indicator	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total				
	(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.

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison					
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
80	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Com	nparison	0%				

			MATH	ł		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison					
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				

	SCIENCE												
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison							
08	2019												

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Com	nparison					

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
•		ALGEB	RA EOC	•	
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	
BLK												
FRL												
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS			
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.

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	0			
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES			
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2			
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency				
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index				
Total Components for the Federal Index				
Percent Tested	74%			
Subgroup Data				
Students With Disabilities				
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities				
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A			
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0			
English Language Learners				
Federal Index - English Language Learners				
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0			
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%	0			
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%	0			

Black/African American Students			
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	0		
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?			
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1		
Hispanic Students			
Federal Index - Hispanic Students			
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?			
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0		
Multiracial Students	<u> </u>		
Federal Index - Multiracial Students			
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A		
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?			
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0		
White Students			
Federal Index - White Students			
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A		
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	<u>, </u>		
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0		
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES		
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1		

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 performance of Black/African Americans and Economically Disadvantaged students is low in the areas of ELA and Math

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

Assessment scores showed a greater decrease in Math.

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.

There is a gap of concern in the areas of both reading and math.

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

Most of the improvement was in the area of ELA.

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

An area of concern is prevalent among the students who are economically disadvantaged as well as Black/ African American students.

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

- 1. Course performance in the areas of Math and ELA of Economically Disadvantaged and Black/ African American students
- 2. Continuation of the Personal Growth Model (AMIKids) focusing on improving Education, Treatment and Behavioral Modification of Economically Disadvantaged and Black/African American students
- 3. Increase the percentage of students tested.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus **Description** and Rationale:

Teachers will use differentiated instruction to increase student achievement on the common assessment in the areas of reading and math. Currently, the average entrance score on the Common Assessment is 27% for reading and 29% for math. Current exit scores are 41% for reading and 35% for math. This is only a 14% grade increase for reading and 6% grade increase for math. Differentiated instructions is needed to target individual student goals and to help each student increase his scores in reading and math. On-going progress monitoring will be conducted via Achieve 3000, other computer based assessments and teacher made assessments.

All students taking Common and Statewide Assessments will make a 20% increase in their scores in Math by May 2021.

All students taking Common and Statewide Assessment will make a 10% increase in their

Measurable Outcome:

scores in Reading by May 2021.

100% of Black/ African Am. and Economically disadvantaged students will participate in Tier 2 academic instruction using Achieve 3000 or other computer based instruction to accomplish a minimum of one bucket level improvement over the course of one school year.

Person responsible

for Earnest Wood (earnest.wood@hcps.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-Using differentiated Instruction based

Strategy:

Using the co-teach (FUSE) model for instruction.

Rationale

for HCPS offers this research based strategy as in-service for teachers throughout the school Evidenceyear. Youth Services and AMIkids will provide training in this area via small learning communities.

based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

To help increase Common Assessment reading and writing scores, teachers will be trained in differentiated instruction through Hillsborough County in-services as well as AMIKids and Youth Services small learning communities. School administrators and the AMIkids, Director of Education will follow-up with teachers throughout the year, looking for evidence of differentiated instruction in lesson plans and in classroom instruction via walk-throughs and teacher observations.

Person Responsible

Earnest Wood (earnest.wood@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of AMI Kids Personal Growth Model will be implemented to decrease negative interactions

and prepare students to return to traditional educational settings. Focus

Student Services will present Social Emotional Learning Strategies to assist with Description developing and improving Behavioral Skills for Black/African Am. and Economically and

Disadvantaged Students. Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Students will increase from entry rank (recruit) to graduation rank before their release date. All Black/Afr. Am. and Economically Disadvantaged students will receive assistance through behavioral supports to matriculate through the established rank system by their

release day.

Person responsible

Earnest Wood (earnest.wood@hcps.net) for

monitoring outcome:

Students will work daily to earn points tallied on their point cards to meet individual

Evidencetreatment goals. based

Student will follow the "personal growth model", which focuses on Treatment, Education, Strategy:

and Behavior Modification.

Rationale for Evidence-

Data of The Personal Growth Model, which focuses on Treatment, Education and Behavior Modification has been proven to assist with improving behavior behavior and based

matriculating students back to traditional education setting successfully Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Building effective communication within the school

Catering for individual needs

Developing democratic processes

Enhancing self esteem

Fostering respect for diversity

Fostering inclusive and respectful language

Developing appropriate communication between home/school/facility

Developing a school approach to assessment

AMIkids is guided by its guiding principles: Kids First!, Family, and Safety

All students learn the Core Values of AMIkids and recite them during their rank board review panel.

These are creativity, honesty, enthusiasm, integrity, loyalty, leadership, diversity, goal orientation, excellence, dedication, and respect

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2 III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
	Total:	\$0.00