Armwood High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Armwood High School

12000 E US HIGHWAY 92, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dina Langston

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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

Armwood High School

12000 E US HIGHWAY 92, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

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 9-12	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

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 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.

Every student, everyday, no excuses

Provide the school's vision statement.

Armwood High School will work with our families and community to provide an atmosphere that challenges our students to be college and career ready.

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
Langston, Dina	Principal	
James, Stacey	Instructional Coach	Matthew Johnson-Assistant Principal for Curriculum Shannon Pilcher-Reading Coach Amy Hyers-Writing Coach Laura Widerberg-Science Coach Patrick Kelly-Student Success Coach Katherine Curtis-Social Studies Resource Lisa Young-Collegiate Academy Magnet Lead Stacey Bruton-AVID Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/9/2020, Dina Langston

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.*
1

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.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
144

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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	579	551	482	492	2104
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	281	290	228	239	1038
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	16	8	87
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	172	157	157	134	620
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	158	82	80	479

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	22	27	13	7	69

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	
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													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	56%	56%	36%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	54%	51%	39%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	41%	42%	34%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	31%	49%	51%	37%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	48%	48%	43%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	45%	45%	29%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	62%	69%	68%	38%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	75%	73%	73%	74%	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	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	42%	53%	-11%	53%	-11%
	2018	39%	52%	-13%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	59%	66%	-7%	67%	-8%
2018	60%	62%	-2%	65%	-5%
Compare		-1%			

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	71%	73%	-2%	70%	1%
2018	63%	70%	-7%	68%	-5%
Compare		8%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	15%	63%	-48%	61%	-46%
2018	17%	63%	-46%	62%	-45%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	57%	-23%	57%	-23%
2018	37%	56%	-19%	56%	-19%
Compare		-3%			

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	15	32	29	21	22	21	54	56		79	10
ELL	14	36	38	15	33	27	55	40		74	38
ASN	67	60		58							
BLK	37	48	38	25	31	23	50	61		90	26
HSP	39	46	38	27	31	25	58	66		86	41
MUL	64	46		32	35		80	91		68	40
WHT	54	57	34	40	36	25	76	87		80	43
FRL	36	45	37	26	29	25	56	67		84	30

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	19	43	39	15	27	27	32	28		75	20
ELL	14	37	38	20	40	48	31	34		80	30
ASN	31	53									
BLK	34	44	40	24	32	27	61	49		86	26
HSP	39	49	47	33	40	33	54	62		85	42
MUL	69	60		39	55		83	82		90	32
WHT	54	53	52	42	43	25	79	77		84	49
FRL	36	47	44	28	36	29	59	59		83	28

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	10	32	32	15	35	31	15	51		59	30
ELL	8	28	24	22	38	29	26	47		65	42
ASN	27	64		33							
BLK	28	39	35	29	38	25	30	63		72	10
HSP	31	36	30	34	41	34	35	71		74	43
MUL	52	38		53	48		46	89		94	40
WHT	48	43	34	48	49	28	50	89		70	39
FRL	28	36	31	30	38	27	36	69		70	24

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	37
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	
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	62
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	42
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	45
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	53
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	43
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.

Our math scores showed the lowest performance with Geometry decreasing by 3% and Algebra decreasing by 2%. We believe that there were several factors that contributed to the drop. We had several vacancies throughout the year and lour students lack of exposure to higher level math EOC style questions.

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

Geometry. We believe this was again due to teacher vacancies and student movement within the classes.

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.

Algebra. Our students were not exposed to EOC style questioning enough over the course of the year so they did not know how to apply their knowledge to the types of questions. Teacher vacancies may have also contributed.

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

History EOC showed the most improvement. We increased our score by 10%. Our US History teachers were trained in pulling literacy data and reading/writing strategies. They also created and utilized differentiated lessons, held writing conferences with students and put an emphasis on targeting students based on several data sources.

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

9th grade students with a GOA of 2.0 or higher. We know how closely tied 9th grade GPAs are to graduation rates so this is very important for us to monitor.

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

1. Standard Based Instruction
2. Graduation Rates
3. English Language Learners
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have identified this as an area of need based on our FSA & EOC data being below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to be at 50% or higher for proficiency and gains on each FSA & EOC assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through Professional Development, we will be exposing our teachers to TNTP's Opportunity Myth, Hattie, Fisher & Frey's Visible Learning framework and approaches, Achieve 3000, & Academic Moves. We also plan to help teachers create tasks aligned to cognitive complexity and ensure students' evidence of thinking is reaching the standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We need to clarify the process for teachers and give them explicit strategies and tools to be successful. We want to equip our teachers with strategies to help them deconstruct standards and align tasks during lesson planning, After attending workshops and trainings, we feel that these will be the best routes to engage our teachers and students. We will monitor learning and implementation through informal and formal observations, PLCS logs, formative school data and through professional development evaluation forms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing PLC leader trainings (department heads)
2. Teachers can attend Academic Moves & Achieve 3000 trainings through the district's PD offerings. Follow up will occur through PLCs.
3. Create Support Facilitation in Science and Social Studies so that our VE teachers will able to check in with a smaller group, creating small groups, and remediating where needed for our SWD.
4. Group our ELL students in a cohort so that the instructor can incorporate specific strategies that better meet those students' needs. Strategy support will come from ESOL Resource Teacher.
5. Train our Department Heads so they can train their teachers on a resource through Google that helps to translate reading passages, worksheets, and other instructional strategies to better help our ELL students follow along.

Person Responsible	Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We are hoping that through the house system, we can focus on the culture of our faculty, staff and students. We want to build a culture for teaching and learning in all aspects of our school. Our goal in having a parent liaison, assistant teachers and deans, is that more hands on deck will show students we care and provide more opportunities for positive adult role models and mentors. We also hope this, along with the house system, will help us with day to day behavior management and overall running of student affairs. Lastly, we are planning on training our teachers in culturally responsive teaching and intervention to address equity and diversity in our classrooms.

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.

We send out a weekly newsletter to all parents with an email on file. Our newsletter highlights student life, athletics, important dates and information. We use our school twitter to send this same information via social media. We also make sure that our website stays up to date so that students, parents and community stakeholders can get the information they need. We hold a preprogramming breakfast for parents and community members so they can see what programs and electives we have to offer students. We make our open houses very special by showcasing our clubs and CTE programs throughout the hallways. We hold parent informational nights about completing the FAFSA/ getting financial aid. We also hold parents nights for our at-risk students. Our service clubs are out in the community performing service every weekend. We have also reached out to local businesses and organizations such as the Seffner Chamber of Commerce to partner with our school. We have created a Community Engagement Committee made up of teachers and administrators to discuss and implement ways to get parents, the community and local businesses more involved in our school but also to identify ways for our students and programs to get more involved with feeder schools and local businesses.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00