

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Hillsborough High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Hillsborough High School

5000 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Kevin Gordon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Hillsborough High School

5000 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[ 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	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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.

We will prepare all students for the world they will encounter after high school.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student, without exception, future 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
King, Kelly	Principal	School leader. Devises strategies for student achievement, monitors academic data, encourages parent involvement, develops and enforces policies and procedures, administers budget, hires and evaluates staff and oversee facilities.
Morris, Charles	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum - Devises strategies for student achievement, monitors academic data, develops master schedule, hires and evaluates staff.
Fitzgerald, Trisha	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum for Magnet IB - Devises strategies for student achievement, monitors academic data, develops master schedule for IB, hires for IB and evaluates staff.
Brooks, Eric	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Administration - Oversees facilities and athletics, maintains school calendar, monitors school data, hires and evaluates staff.
Mitchell, Travian	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs - Assists with enrollment and withdrawals, monitors academic and behavioral data, works with parents and students to develop plans for student achievement, and evaluates staff.
Witek, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs - Assists with enrollment and withdrawals, monitors academic and behavioral data, works with parents and students to develop plans for student achievement, and evaluates staff.
	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs - Assists with enrollment and withdrawals, monitors academic and behavioral data, works with parents and students to develop plans for student achievement, and evaluates staff.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kevin Gordon

**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.*

2

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

119

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>



<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	519	485	452	415	1871
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	217	191	182	816
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	46	42	38	199
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	186	210	104	722
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	186	210	104	722
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	144	131	117	550
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	107	102	26	370

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	14	10	10	2	36

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	16	0	0	0	16
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	492	470	375	425	1762
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	96	114	114	401
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	135	97	70	454
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	121	132	124	536
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	154	99	52	463

**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	
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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	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	492	470	375	425	1762	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	96	114	114	401	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	135	97	70	454	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	121	132	124	536	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	154	99	52	463	

**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	
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	49%	56%	56%	42%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	54%	51%	43%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	41%	42%	28%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	41%	49%	51%	40%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	43%	48%	48%	43%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	45%	34%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	69%	68%	54%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	75%	73%	65%	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	47%	55%	-8%	55%	-8%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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	80%	62%	18%	65%	15%
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	66%	73%	-7%	70%	-4%
2018	55%	70%	-15%	68%	-13%
Compare		11%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	63%	-33%	61%	-31%
2018	19%	63%	-44%	62%	-43%
Compare		11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	57%	-10%	57%	-10%
2018	46%	56%	-10%	56%	-10%
Compare		1%			

### 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	8	39	36	13	26	22	23	45		81	26
ELL	19	44	42	30	51	48	30	31		74	56
ASN	93	81		100			97	87		96	96
BLK	28	42	38	31	39	37	48	57		85	39

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
HSP	38	50	41	34	41	47	52	65		84	63
MUL	65	71		41			62	64		100	67
WHT	81	68	60	72	56		90	88		94	87
FRL	34	48	40	32	41	46	49	59		83	54
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	16	23	19	12	32	29	75	30		71	10
ELL	15	34	32	20	40	50	85	33		66	60
ASN	93	64		92	78		98	96		97	97
BLK	25	41	33	23	39	49	67	45		76	32
HSP	41	42	29	30	47	51	78	55		79	63
MUL	85	56		58			90	82		88	60
WHT	77	63	33	68	73	75	91	84		93	68
FRL	34	42	31	27	43	49	75	50		77	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	10	17	16	11	24	24	27	39		64	19
ELL	8	29	30	24	34	35	19	31		51	50
ASN	92	81		96	89		100	96		100	88
BLK	18	28	24	19	27	20	38	47		69	26
HSP	36	38	26	37	40	41	45	63		75	44
MUL	57	67		46	30		75	80		80	83
WHT	74	63	62	66	62	53	77	86		89	82
FRL	27	33	28	29	35	33	42	54		69	37

### 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	93
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	44
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	51
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	67
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	
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	77
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	49
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.**

No new data from 19-20 due to 4th quarter e-learning and no State Assessments.

The lowest performing data component was student proficiency on the Algebra FSA. This is a trend; in 2017-18, 19% of students showed proficiency in Algebra. In both years, this was our lowest data component.

Many of our students come to Hillsborough with gaps in their math skills; previous year data from feeder schools indicates a majority of our Algebra students entering high school at a Level 1 or Level 2 proficiency. While our students may not show proficiency after a year of instruction, 54% of students did show gains in algebra or geometry when compared to the previous year's data.

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

The greatest decline was proficiency on the Biology EOC. From 2017-18 to 201819, the percentage of students showing proficiency on this assessment declined from 80% to 59%.

However, this decrease was anticipated. In 2016-17, 48% of HHS students showed proficiency on this assessment, and the administrative team made the decision to provide our non-English speaking ELL students with an additional year of a foundational science before placing them in biology. This intentional delay allowed this subgroup of students to build their foundational science skills and vocabulary before taking an EOC course.

These students took biology in 2018-19 and participated in the EOC. Comparing 16-17 proficiency

(48%) to 18-19 proficiency (59%) shows that this extra year may have made a difference in helping students better prepare for this course.

**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.**

The school component that has the biggest gap when compared to the state average is student proficiency on the Algebra EOC. 30% of HHS students showed proficiency in algebra, compared to 63% across the state. This is a trend. In 2017-18, 19% of HHS students showed proficiency in algebra, compared to 63% across the state. While we will continue to focus on this area, we are pleased with the 11% increase in proficiency between 2017-18 and 2018-19.

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

Both the Algebra EOC and the US History EOC show an 11% increase in proficiency.

Algebra - In 2017-18, 19% of HHS students showed proficiency in algebra, compared to 30% in 2018-19. Algebra teachers refocused their efforts to teach and assess at the rigor of the state standards. Teachers scaffolded the material to meet students at their individual levels and worked from there to increase proficiency. Furthermore, free afterschool tutoring was offered to our ESOL students in an effort to help these students remediate their gaps in math in order to be able to work at grade level.

US History – In 2017-18, 55% of HHS students showed proficiency in US History, compared to 66% in 2018-19. US History teachers focused not only on teaching and assessing standards, but also continuously reviewing material and making connections to previously taught standards. Teachers also used mini-assessments to target specific areas.

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

EWS data clearly indicates that we need to focus on how we can better support our freshman in terms of behavior, course failures, and performance on state assessments.

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

1. SWD
2. Attendance
3. ELL
4. Bottom quartile students
5. Grade rate/graduation requirement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Teachers must have a comprehensive understanding of what students are expected to learn in order to teach the material effectively. Furthermore, common formative assessments allow for like comparisons in student learning and promotes collaboration within PLCs for analysis of instructional strategies and alignment with standards.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	100% of faculty will participate in course PLCs on a regular basis. Walkthrough data will indicate that 80% of teachers are planning and presenting lessons based on course content standards. This multi-pronged approach (planning instruction, delivering instruction, and assessing instruction) focuses on teaching the state standards and will result in more engaging and rigorous instruction, as well as increasing proficiency on end-of-course assessments.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instructional learning walks</li> <li>- Student-centered instruction</li> <li>- Coaching</li> <li>- PrepWorks</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instructional learning walks allow the ILT to see teaching and learning "in action." Feedback is provided to teachers during one-on-one coaching meetings.</li> <li>- Student-centered lessons increase student engagement and participation. Teachers will work together to plan standards-based learning experiences that require students take a more "active" role in the lesson. Substitutes and t-pays may be used to provide time for teachers to plan together and/or participate in professional development. T-pays may also be utilized to lower class sized and offer students opportunities to take additional courses outside of the school day.</li> <li>- Math and reading teachers will work with subject-area specific coaches to plan lessons, dileniate student data, and create common assessments. A teacher talent developer will also be available to all teachers to work on these same areas.</li> <li>- PrepWorks provides student-centered and standards-based tutoring our upper level reading courses, geometry, algebra, US History and biology.</li> </ul>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. All faculty members will participate in PLCs. Each PLC will focus on disaggregating student data and purposeful planning for instruction based on both student needs and course standards and creating common formative assessments. Effectiveness will be monitored through a reflection log indicating standards and lessons planned for.
2. The Instructional Leadership Team will provide ongoing feedback as learning walks take place throughout the year. Effectiveness will be monitored through ongoing assessment of instruction and student progress on standars based assessment.
3. Students will take standards-based common assessments throughout the year to ensure progress.

**Person Responsible** Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

**#2. Other specifically relating to Hillsborough High School will intentionally plan for student success****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Many of our students need additional support in order to be show academic, emotional, and social success

**Measurable Outcome:** Students in identified subgroups will receive additional classroom support, struggling students will receive graduation support, and all students will feel safe at school.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Charles Morris (charles.morris@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Assistant teacher position
- ACT/SAT tutor
- Parent and family engagement
- PrepWorks
- AVID

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Many of our students need additional academic and emotional support. The Student Success Coach works with targeted students to improve school performance and meet graduation requirements.

- The assistant teacher position will be at the main entrance of the school to greet visitors and support school safety.
- About one-third of traditional seniors have not met the reading graduation requirement. The ACT/SAT tutor will provide targeted support to these students.
- Parent and family engagement includes providing multiple avenues to communicate school events - including mailing newsletters to families with online access. Family engagement also incorporates providing classroom supplies for students when needed.
- PrepWorks will provide online tutoring to identified subgroups, including our ESE and ESOL students, to teach and assess specific areas where students need additional support.
- AVID ensures that students who need additional remediation are provided support through afterschool programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers and AVID tutorials. Coursework is designed to help students make both cross-curricular and within subjects connections and to establish relevancy to a student's future.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The instructional leadership team will identify students in each subgroup who need additional supports.
2. Each group of students will be given to the appropriate leader to implement stated strategies.
3. Ongoing assessments and check ins will take place throughout the school year to ensure ongoing gains.

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

### #3. Other specifically relating to : Hillsborough High School will maintain a whole-school approach to teaching literacy in all content areas

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	In order to provide students with ongoing literacy support, teachers in all subject areas need the skills to effectively adapt their curriculum within a literacy framework that focuses on helping students both develop foundational literacy strategies and understand the content standards.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Students will utilize literacy in all content areas which will not only result in increased proficiency on assessments, but also increase students' ability to apply literacy skills both across curriculums and real-world situations.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Charles Morris (charles.morris@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reading teacher participation in PLCs</li> <li>- Instructional walk throughs</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many of our content-area teachers are not familiar with how to incorporate literacy strategies into their curriculum. A reading teacher will participate in each content area PLC in order to inform literacy instruction and provide strategies (reading, speaking, writing, decoding, and comprehending) that are specific to the content.</li> <li>- In order to assess implementation of literacy skills, the instructional leadership will complete non-evaluative bi-weekly literacy walkthroughs. Feedback from the team will focus on the lesson's literacy components and offer guiding questions for next steps.</li> </ul>

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. PLCs will take place monthly. A reading teacher will be scheduled to attend each PLC.
2. Teachers will implement reading strategies into thier daily lessons.
3. ILWs will be scheduled twice each month to assess a literacy instruction within a content area.
4. Feedback and coaching will be provided to the classroom teacher.
5. Teacher will implement feedback and continue making additions and adjustments based on student need.

**Person Responsible** Charles Morris (charles.morris@hcps.net)

#### #4. Other specifically relating to Hillsborough High School will intentionally plan for ESE student growth

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Special education students often need additional supports and opportunities to reach full academic and social potential.

**Measurable Outcome:** The number of special education students making measurable gains on the FSA ELA and math assessments will increase by 10 percent.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Charles Morris (charles.morris@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Special education students in algebra, geometry, English I and English II will receive additional academic support both during and outside of the school day.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Special education students often need additional supports and opportunities to reach full academic and social potential. Our current data indicates that only 26% of Hillsborough ESE students made gains in math and only 39% made gains in ELA.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify ESE students in the above-mentioned courses
2. Work in PLCs to analyze student data in order to determine areas where students need additional assistance
3. Provide small-group instruction on these areas during class time
4. Offer afterschool tutoring in all academic areas the is specifically geared to ESE students
5. Continuously re-analyze data for student growth

**Person Responsible** Charles Morris (charles.morris@hcps.net)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The remaining school wide improvement priorities are addressed in the SIP. As data indicates other issues and priorities throughout the year, the ILT and/or the Student Services Team will meet to analyze and plan next steps.**

### 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.

Regular meetings with:

1. Steering committee
2. School Advisory Council
3. IB- 5 Year Parent-Student Study

Continuous communication through:

1. Remind
2. ParentLink
3. Emails
4. Canvas
5. The Red and Black (monthly publication)
6. Terrier Talk (Alumni- Community Communication)

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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