

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lennard High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lennard High School

2002 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Denise Savino

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2020

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)	88%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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

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

Lennard High School

2002 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

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	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

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.

As a united and diverse community, we will provide all students with modern skills that will prepare them for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Guiding graduates to a life of learning.

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
Savino, Denise	Principal	Principal- Active participant in the decisions of the SIP team.
Lane, Sharon	SAC Member	Technology Teacher - SAC Chair
Wohlgamuth, Diana	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach - Math - Liaison for each grade level and/or content area.
Stanley, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach - Reading - Liaison for each grade level and/or content area
Amar, Nabile	Assistant Principal	SIP team member
Given, James	Assistant Principal	SIP team member
Greene, Talana	Assistant Principal	SIP team member
Guarisco, John	Assistant Principal	SIP team member
Lawson, Denise	Instructional Coach	SIP team member
Steele, Nikol	Assistant Principal	SIP team member
Wilson, Bobby	Assistant Principal	SIP team member

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/4/2020, Denise Savino

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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)	88%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	532	560	493	673	2258
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203	231	214	268	916
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	17	12	74
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	111	137	126	170	544
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	118	40	102	342

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	18	14	8	8	48

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	934	877	778	686	3275
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	160	161	174	643
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	90	45	14	218
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245	220	151	74	690
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323	282	227	125	957

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	112	111	83	41	347

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	934	877	778	686	3275
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	160	161	174	643
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	90	45	14	218
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245	220	151	74	690
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323	282	227	125	957

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	112	111	83	41	347

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	42%	56%	56%	40%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	54%	51%	45%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	41%	42%	29%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	44%	49%	51%	64%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	48%	48%	63%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	45%	50%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	69%	68%	61%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	75%	73%	68%	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	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	40%	53%	-13%	53%	-13%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	53%	-11%
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	57%	62%	-5%	65%	-8%
Compare		2%			
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	68%	73%	-5%	70%	-2%
2018	57%	70%	-13%	68%	-11%
Compare		11%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	63%	-34%	61%	-32%
2018	33%	63%	-30%	62%	-29%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	57%	-6%	57%	-6%
2018	53%	56%	-3%	56%	-3%
Compare		-2%			

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	24	19	25	46	45	29	36		78	10
ELL	8	26	26	24	37	27	16	41		63	15
ASN	95	50		92	64		100			100	30
BLK	35	43	28	39	47	47	55	64		95	43

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	33	37	25	39	50	41	50	60		79	28
MUL	52	58		58	36		47	83		89	47
WHT	60	55	25	56	55	56	79	82		88	50
FRL	34	38	26	38	48	45	52	61		82	31
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	32	27	17	38	50	43	26		59	9
ELL	9	34	34	24	49	67	27	25		58	25
ASN	84	68					90	87			
BLK	39	47	31	39	52	38	54	50		88	33
HSP	31	42	30	40	58	58	51	51		75	29
MUL	50	58		54	50		75	71		89	59
WHT	65	56	35	61	63	55	74	77		87	44
FRL	35	44	30	41	57	52	54	51		77	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	23	21	35	45	40	39	35		63	12
ELL	5	25	25	37	48	50	26	37		53	11
ASN	75	67		77	82		86				
BLK	38	46	35	62	58	47	50	67		83	23
HSP	29	39	26	56	59	45	56	63		71	24
MUL	53	51		63	75		60	89		90	61
WHT	60	57	40	76	67	59	75	75		83	37
FRL	32	41	28	57	58	47	54	63		71	26

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	49
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	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	76
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
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	61
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	45
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.

31% ELA Bottom Quartile and 46% Math Achievement

-Lack of fidelity in classroom instruction

-Need for more progress monitoring

-Lack of individual student tracking

Federal Index for Students with Disabilities is 33%

-ELA Achievement for SWD students is 25%

-Math Achievement for SWD students is 25%

Federal Index for English Language Learners is 29%

-ELA Achievement for ELL Students is 8%

-Math Achievement for ELL student sis 24%

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

Math Achievement is down 18%

Math Learning Gains in the bottom 25% for our ELL subgroup dropped from 67% to 27%

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

There was a 13% decrease in ELA Achievement, ELA Bottom Quartile, and Social Studies Achievement.

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

There was an Increase of 3% in the ELA Bottom Quartile.

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

Course Failures (782) and Level 1 on Statewide assessments (902)

-Both of these data points need to be addressed

-Course failures are significantly lower in the 9th grade, than 10th, 11th and 12 grades

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

1. Student tracking of Standards-based learning
2. ELA 9th and 10th grade learning gains
3. Bottom Quartile Math and ELA
4. Course Failures based on KPI data
5. Classroom tardies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Reading comprehension across all content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

Decrease in students scoring Level 1 on statewide assessments
 Decrease in course failure in ELA and Math
 Increase Social Studies Achievement from 58% to 63%
 Increase Math Achievement from 46% to 51%
 Increase Algebra ECO from 33% to 38%
 Increase Geometry ECO from 53% to 58%
 Increase ELA Achievement for SWD subgroup from 15% to 20%
 Increase Math Achievement from SWD subgroup for 17% to 22%
 Increase ELA Achievement for ELL subgroup from 9% to 14%
 Increase Math Achievement for ELL subgroup from 24% to 29%
 Decrease classroom tardies

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diana Wohlgamuth (diana.wohlgamuth@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will analyze individual student data and modify assignments/assessments to meet individual needs. Teachers will conduct students data conference and utilize student driven instruction.

Teachers will:

Analyze individual student data

Introduce meta-cognition skills

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Modify assignments and assessments to meet individual needs

Utilize student driven instruction

Conduct student/Teacher data conferences

Teachers will add reading comprehension strategies in lessons

Students will demonstrate comprehension through written responses

Students will analysis rigorous text using literacy strategies

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be engaged in various formative assessments.

Teachers will engage students in the "high order" thinking techniques.

Teachers will probe and teach for "understanding".

Reading strategies will be address by providing appropriate level text.

Formative assessments will be used to provide evidence of mastery.

PLC's will identify student centered reading strategies to use in all content areas.

Coaches and AVID Coordinator will provide training for teachers throughout the year on student reading comprehension strategies.

Teachers will use the results of standards-based assessments to facilitate meaningful student centered reading strategies.

Academic Coaches will conduct coaching cycles to monitor fidelity of assessment and instruction.

Technology/programs and technology support will be provided to enhance individualized instruction.

Student Affairs will conduct walkthroughs with a focus on student centered reading comprehension strategies.

Student Success coach, Assistant Teachers, and Teacher Leaders will support students who do not master these skills in Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible

Denise Lawson (denise.lawson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Lennard High School's stakeholders builds a positive culture and environment by...

1. Promoting Systems- PBIS, LAMP, Principals' (Mrs. Savino's) weekly spotlights both staff and students, etc...
2. Displaying visual promotions- Lennard Ps, positive graffiti, take or give a smile sheets, etc.
3. Giving verbal promotions- greeting students at the door, daily announcements, positive mottos (You are never alone), etc...
4. Conducting a quarterly reward for students nominated by teachers or No tardies. A 30-minute assembly with games or pizza.
5. Developing a community center for the kids in the neighborhoods. Work in unison with the Boys and Girls clubs.
6. Structuring the student council volunteers group that work in the community.
7. Organizing an "L-Block" which is a school spirit activity for all of the sports/athletes and other activities.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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