

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# King 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>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Gregory Basham**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: B (54%)<br>2015-16: C (51%)   |
| <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>  |

# King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School<br/>9-12</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">68%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>        | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | C              | C              | C              | B              |

## 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.

King High School will support all students' growth as critical thinkers, global citizens and informed decision makers.

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

Our vision is to become a community which demonstrates the principals of P.R.I.D.E. (Positivity, Responsibility, Integrity, Determination and Excellence)

### 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   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Castelli, Arlene    | Principal           | Principal will oversee School Improvement Plan and hold school site stakeholders accountable.   |
| Kight, Jessica      | SAC Member          | Calls and holds SAC Meetings. Creates agenda and communicates meeting agendas   |
| Grieb, Lori Sue     | Instructional Coach | Interprets and shares data with stakeholders. Works with departments on assessment data helping keep all informed of student progress                     |
| Finch, Christian    | Assistant Principal | Insures teachers are giving out proper and timely assessments which will help measure student growth. Helps intervene and provide resources where needed. |
| Maddox, Samantha    | Assistant Principal | Insures teachers are giving out proper and timely assessments which will help measure student growth. Helps intervene and provide resources where needed. |
| Stone-Geide, Bianca | Other               | Student Success Coach. Monitors case load of at risk students and helps provide support where needed  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Gregory Basham

**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.*

6

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

91

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: B (54%)<br>2015-16: C (51%)   |
| <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 | 0 | 415 | 401 | 435 | 408   | 1659 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 179 | 183 | 148   | 715  |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 4   | 5   | 2     | 16   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 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   | 0     | 0    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 122 | 0   | 0     | 262  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 119 | 0   | 0     | 246  |
|   | 0           | 0 | 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 | 12 | 65 | 47 | 46    | 170 |

**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     | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/30/2020

**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 | 434 | 474 | 451 | 424   | 1783 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 94  | 73  | 89    | 321  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 53  | 42  | 22    | 154  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 82  | 64  | 68    | 322  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 94  | 73  | 89    | 321  |

**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 | 52 | 54 | 39 | 32    | 177 |

**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 | 5  | 0  | 0  | 4     | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 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 | 0 | 434 | 474 | 451 | 424   | 1783 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 94  | 73  | 89    | 321  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 53  | 42  | 22    | 154  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 82  | 64  | 68    | 322  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 94  | 73  | 89    | 321  |

**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 | 52 | 54 | 39 | 32    | 177 |

**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 | 5  | 0  | 0  | 4     | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 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             | 48%    | 56%      | 56%   | 49%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 55%    | 54%      | 51%   | 54%    | 50%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 36%    | 41%      | 42%   | 37%    | 39%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 28%    | 49%      | 51%   | 41%    | 51%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 33%    | 48%      | 48%   | 41%    | 47%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43%    | 45%      | 45%   | 42%    | 38%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 55%    | 69%      | 68%   | 58%    | 62%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 74%    | 75%      | 73%   | 78%    | 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 | 46%    | 55%      | -9%                        | 55%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 53%      | -9%                        | 53%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 44%    | 53%      | -9%                        | 53%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 50%    | 52%      | -2%                        | 53%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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        | 52%    | 66%      | -14%                  | 67%   | -15%               |
| 2018        | 46%    | 62%      | -16%                  | 65%   | -19%               |
| Compare     |        | 6%       |                       |       |                    |

| 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        | 73%    | 73%      | 0%                    | 70%   | 3%                 |
| 2018        | 70%    | 70%      | 0%                    | 68%   | 2%                 |
| Compare     |        | 3%       |                       |       |                    |

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 12%    | 63%      | -51%                  | 61%   | -49%               |
| 2018        | 23%    | 63%      | -40%                  | 62%   | -39%               |
| Compare     |        | -11%     |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 34%    | 57%      | -23%                  | 57%   | -23%               |
| 2018         | 40%    | 56%      | -16%                  | 56%   | -16%               |
| Compare      |        | -6%      |                       |       |                    |

**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                                       | 14       | 35     | 33          | 16        | 24      | 31           | 26       | 49      |           | 77                | 6                   |
| ELL                                       | 16       | 47     | 42          | 17        | 41      | 50           | 28       | 46      |           | 60                | 27                  |
| ASN                                       | 92       | 86     |             | 78        | 60      |              | 96       | 92      |           | 98                | 92                  |
| BLK                                       | 23       | 40     | 35          | 14        | 27      | 37           | 26       | 54      |           | 79                | 17                  |

| 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     | 45          | 21        | 31      | 70           | 55       | 71      |           | 75                | 52                  |
| MUL                                       | 63       | 63     |             | 40        | 23      |              | 72       | 94      |           | 100               | 56                  |
| WHT                                       | 62       | 57     | 35          | 47        | 47      |              | 71       | 97      |           | 92                | 71                  |
| FRL                                       | 28       | 44     | 37          | 19        | 31      | 45           | 35       | 62      |           | 79                | 26                  |
| 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       | 32     | 25          | 8         | 26      | 26           | 17       | 40      |           | 67                | 6                   |
| ELL                                       | 11       | 24     | 27          | 20        | 40      | 46           | 25       | 38      |           | 73                | 30                  |
| ASN                                       | 95       | 80     |             | 92        | 89      |              | 96       | 100     |           | 100               | 91                  |
| BLK                                       | 21       | 31     | 21          | 18        | 37      | 40           | 22       | 52      |           | 84                | 22                  |
| HSP                                       | 39       | 40     | 37          | 36        | 43      | 50           | 41       | 71      |           | 83                | 43                  |
| MUL                                       | 68       | 65     |             | 50        | 50      |              | 79       | 94      |           | 70                | 57                  |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 64     | 25          | 53        | 65      |              | 78       | 84      |           | 92                | 71                  |
| FRL                                       | 28       | 37     | 25          | 21        | 37      | 44           | 33       | 58      |           | 82                | 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                                       | 5        | 29     | 34          | 7         | 29      | 34           | 9        | 35      |           | 54                | 9                   |
| ELL                                       | 7        | 34     | 34          | 15        | 26      | 26           | 23       | 57      |           | 68                | 40                  |
| ASN                                       | 97       | 78     |             | 91        | 68      | 60           | 98       | 97      |           | 100               | 93                  |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 38     | 38          | 16        | 29      | 38           | 30       | 62      |           | 74                | 23                  |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 50     | 32          | 36        | 36      | 33           | 54       | 75      |           | 78                | 44                  |
| MUL                                       | 70       | 71     |             | 47        | 44      |              | 71       | 81      |           | 92                | 71                  |
| WHT                                       | 70       | 66     | 40          | 65        | 52      | 60           | 77       | 93      |           | 90                | 69                  |
| FRL                                       | 23       | 40     | 37          | 21        | 30      | 38           | 36       | 67      |           | 77                | 28                  |

**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  | 51   |
| 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 | 58   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 566  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11   |
| Percent Tested  | 97%  |

| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 31  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 2   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 39  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 87  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 36  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 52  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 64  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   | 64  |
| 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.**

All Math Scores:

Lack of qualified teachers. We have had a lack of qualified teachers for the past 4/5 years. Extended periods of time covered by substitutes. Even with lesson plans - subs could not deliver instruction. Starting first nine weeks off with 2 subs

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

Algebra 1 EoC - Declined - 49% below state. Only 12% of test takers passed EoC  
Lack of qualified teachers. Extended periods of time covered by substitutes. Even with lesson plans - subs could not deliver instruction

**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

Lack of qualified teachers. Extended periods of time covered by substitutes. Even with lesson plans - subs could not deliver instruction

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

Biology EoC

Instructional Coaches and Department Head helped coach new teachers and teachers worked in PLCs to deliver

common assessments. Common planning for lessons with data also helped improve scores

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

- 1 - Attendance. We can't get students in front of us - or on ELearning.
- 2 - Technology Gap - need for more technology resources

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

1. Qualified and Highly Effective teachers for all core subjects
2. School wide Attendance must increase
3. Increase Math scores overall
4. Additional technology resources
5. Catch students up from multiple year learning gaps

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We need Highly Effective qualified teachers in front of our students that will be able to assist them in catching up from missed instruction from prior years. Students have suffered from multiple consecutive years of ineffective instruction primarily due to teacher vacancies. This has contributed to our low scores for at least the past 3 years. Our Black, ELL and SWD population has not shown progress in recent years.

Hire highly qualified teachers to complete our department - no vacancies. Student test scores will increase due to Highly Effective teachers providing quality instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Only 12% of our students taking the Algebra EoC passed and only 34% of our students taking Geometry EoC passed. We are going to increase our Algebra EoC pass rate to 55% and our Geometry EoC pass rate to 55%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Samantha Maddox (samantha.maddox@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

District will lift our hiring restrictions. We will hire quality instructors. Once instructors are hired - all will work in content specific PLCs to review test data and provide appropriate interventions. We will provide support for our students with what we have. (ELP and encourage Khan Academy) We will reach out to community members and any contact from surrounding colleges that will help tutor our students in math to help catch them up.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Tutoring via ELP and use of Khan Academy will help help our students increase their math skills.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Provide ELP Tutoring
- Encourage Khan Academy participation
- Reach out to community and surrounding colleges to see if we can get help with our students.

**Person Responsible**

Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@hcps.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Our Average Daily Attendance rate is at 86.8% (whereas in years past - we have been in the 90% and above. Students are not in the building nor logging in to ELearning     |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | We want to increase our Attendance rate back up to at least 90%+   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Glorimar Leyton (glorimar.leyton@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | We will start an incentive program to encourage students to attend school. We will continue to work with ELearners with technology issues to increase Elearner attendance. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Encouraging students to be part of the school will encourage positive attendance which will lead to higher graduation rates.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

- SSW and Success Coach will:
- 1 - work with Student Affairs and all administration to develop an incentive plan for student attendance.
  - 2 - inform all stakeholders
  - 3 - work with teachers to develop consistent attendance procedures.

**Person Responsible** Glorimar Leyton (glorimar.leyton@hcps.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We will continue to monitor all curricula via Department meetings and PLCs. All department assessments are reviewed by teachers and administrators.**

**Administration will monitor student discipline as well as teacher attendance**

**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 believe that communication and positive relationships with all stakeholders are the two key ingredients for creating and maintaining a positive culture. Our families need to know that their children are being served by teachers that are truly vested in insuring their success. We invite families to come on campus or to participate in any events we have in order for everyone to get a sense of the importance of being on our campus.

We communicate with our stakeholders on a consistent basis sending out information every week so families know what to expect. We have worked tirelessly on insuring we have the proper emails and phone numbers for our families so they stay connected. We realize that the less connected families are - the less connected our students want to be. It is our job to pull all stakeholders together with a common theme of all supporting our students.

We are connecting our students with Hillsborough Community College through a dual enrollment course for College and Career Readiness.

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

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