

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Leto 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Leto High School

4409 W SLIGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Larissa Mccoy

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2020

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)	100%
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 (53%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (48%) 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Leto High School

4409 W SLIGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">87%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">92%</p>

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.

Leto High School will be a productive, well-respected academic institution where competent, caring staff support and encourage all students, where students are engaged in rigorous, relevant work grounded in core content and literacy standards, and where preparation for life is the ultimate goal of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The students and staff at A.P. Leto Comprehensive High School will strive to build a community for successful teaching and learning, that is student-centered, that cultivates caring, confident, respectful citizens, and life-long learners.

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
McCoy-Mitti, Larissa	Principal	
Eugene, Manley	Assistant Principal	
Philpot, Eva	Instructional Coach	
Sciullo, Francesca	Instructional Coach	
Sullivan-Jackson, Robyn	Instructional Coach	
Graffeo, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Artabasy, Babita	Assistant Principal	
Klein, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	
Gehrke, Drew	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/12/2020, Larissa Mccoy

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.*

3

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.*

14

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)	100%
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 (53%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (48%) 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	0	521	477	528	506	2032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	46	75	88	271
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	74	62	44	244
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	55	52	65	277
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	119	74	94	439
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	134	151	0	409
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	57	83	4	153

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	83	66	128	67	344

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

Friday 6/12/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	115	151	150	495
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	110	125	70	416
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	164	189	102	635
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	182	149	88	562

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	152	162	188	106	608

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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	115	151	150	495
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	110	125	70	416
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	164	189	102	635
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	182	149	88	562

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	152	162	188	106	608

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

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%	35%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	51%	40%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	41%	42%	39%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	47%	49%	51%	39%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	48%	48%	45%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	45%	45%	47%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	69%	68%	52%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	75%	73%	58%	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	37%	52%	-15%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%
2018	59%	62%	-3%	65%	-6%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	73%	-19%	70%	-16%
2018	52%	70%	-18%	68%	-16%
Compare		2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	63%	-26%	61%	-24%
2018	32%	63%	-31%	62%	-30%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	57%	-8%	57%	-8%
2018	51%	56%	-5%	56%	-5%
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	15	33	35	32	48	33	23	29		86	20
ELL	25	46	40	34	44	34	42	27		87	46
ASN	65	40		75	67		71			94	59
BLK	39	56	53	35	54	40	56	51		95	33
HSP	48	51	38	46	49	36	62	54		90	44
MUL	43	38								82	
WHT	56	48		54	60		74	60		89	44
FRL	47	51	41	45	50	33	60	54		90	43
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	18	33	33	32	43		31	36		84	14
ELL	15	42	35	31	49	41	34	28		75	47
ASN	59	72		71	73		73	64		90	
BLK	50	50	46	30	54	36	74	60		84	29
HSP	42	50	35	47	59	53	59	52		84	42
MUL	64	50						36			
WHT	50	62	54	48	55	73	67	70		93	46
FRL	42	51	37	45	57	50	58	53		84	42

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	35	38	18	44	43	18	41		76	14
ELL	9	32	38	29	46	44	25	40		57	52
ASN	48	50		48	58			69			
BLK	37	38	31	39	43	40	47	46		75	29
HSP	34	41	39	40	44	47	52	57		74	46
MUL	42	44		33				58			
WHT	30	38	38	36	52	50	50	67		77	36
FRL	32	40	38	37	44	48	49	56		73	44

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	53
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	579
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	67
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	51
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	52
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	52
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance in 2019 was the performance in our Algebra 1 EOC. During the administration of the Alg. 1 EOC in 2019, we had 36% of our students who took the test score a level 3 or higher. In 2018, out of the students who took the Alg. 1 EOC, there were 32% who scored a level 3 or higher. Although the overall passing rate is still low, there is an increase in the passing rate from 2018 to 2019. Our teachers are implementing quality, standards-based instruction in the classroom to ensure that our students acquire the necessary skills that they need in order to pass the Alg. 1 EOC.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from previous year is Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains. In 2019, 37% of the students made learning gains in math. However, in 2018, 53% of the Math Bottom Quartile students made learning gains. Therefore, there was a 16 point drop. As a faculty and staff, we are working on ways to ensure that students are showing academic growth from Pre-Algebra to Algebra 1 EOC, and from Algebra 1 EOC to Geometry EOC.

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.

When compared to the district average, our biggest gap was Social Studies Achievement. As a school district, 75% of our students passed their US History EOC with a level 3 or higher in 2019; and, 73% statewide passed US History EOC. However, 56% of the students at Leto passed their US History EOC with a level 3 or higher this past school year.

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

The data point that showed the most improvement was overall ELA achievement. Our school went from 44 points to 49 points in this category. This past school year our teachers worked diligently to implement quality, standards-based instruction with use of WICOR strategies in the classroom. There has also been a huge push for authentic lesson planning (planning with the end in mind and periodic "checks for understanding" throughout the lesson).

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

Based on the EWS data, one of our top concerns, is the Course Failure in ELA/Math with a high amount of students who failed a semester in ELA or Math course. Administration and school counselors are working on scheduling these students based on the support that they need in order to acquire academic success. For instance, some students may be scheduled in remedial courses and others will take credit recovery class to recover the credit lost. In addition, faculty and staff will work with students to take ownership of academic outcomes via personal data tracking and data-driven goal setting.

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

1. Foster a culture of high academic expectations to demonstrate that "Smart is something you can get."

2. Deliver culturally relevant, high impact, standards-based instruction.
3. Ensure deep engagement with purposeful and consistent use of WICOR strategies.
4. Reduce ISS/OSS suspension percentage rate by implementation of PBIS practices
5. Improve student attendance to school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional practice with standards-aligned instruction is our area of focus because it will enable us to teach to the standards for each subject area in order to ensure that students master important skills and concepts necessary to be proficient on standardized assessments, summative assessments, and formative assessments. This focal point was selected to help support our students in Reading, Writing, and Math. If our students are proficient in those areas, then students can be proficient in Social Studies, Science, and other courses as well. In 2019, 36% of our students scored a level 3 or higher on the Alg. 1 EOC, and 44% of our 10th graders who took the FSA Reading and Writing scored a level 3 or higher. We need to work on building the literacy foundation and support for our students so that they can experience academic success during their high school career.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers in all subject areas will foster a culture of high academic expectations, deliver culturally relevant, high impact, standards-based instruction, and ensure deep engagement with purposeful and consistent use of WICOR strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will take part in the following PLCs in order to build on their professional growth: "Revisiting The Opportunity Myth and Digging the Data" (pre-planning); "Mapping Out Our Journey & Establishing School-Wide Expectations for Teaching and Learning" (pre-planning); "Previewing the Pick Your Own Path Texts (High Expectations, Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain, The Standards-Based Classroom, and High-Impact Instruction) & Delving into Deeper Learning" (pre-planning/ongoing); "AVID 101" (pre-planning/ongoing); "Academic Moves" (pre-planning/ongoing); "Pick Your Own Path Book Study PLCs (Bi-Weekly PLCs); "Differentiated PD" (3x per year); "Strategically Focused Learning Walks" (3x per year). In addition, teachers will have the opportunity to participate in scheduled Learning Walks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: After reviewing our data, we noticed that we need to build a strong foundation in our students' literacy skills (reading & writing) in order to be proficient in their courses that they are undertaking. Our School Improvement Team made the decision to offer these professional development opportunities to our teachers. These strategies are being used to enable teachers to have the necessary tools to support our students in reaching academic success and meeting high academic expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional coaches, ILT, and administrators will foster and facilitate the professional learning community for teachers.
2. Teachers will attend the PD and PLC opportunities offered by school.
3. Teachers will plan collaboratively with their subject area
4. Teachers will regularly self-reflect and set academic goals for students based on student achievement data.
5. Teachers will use the progressive continuum of responses in the classroom in order to hold our students academically accountable and not be able to opt out of responding in class discussions.

Person Responsible Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)

For the 2020-21 school year, our SWD students (ESE) will make adequate yearly progress in order to acquire more points for the ELA Bottom Quartile Gains and the Math Bottom Quartile Gains. In ELA BQ, we will move from 39 to 42 points; In Math BQ, we will move from 37 to 40 points. In order to make this

happen, students will use AVID strategies to enhance learning in the classroom and a school-wide AVID Binder to help them keep their classes organized.

Person Responsible Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will meet at a high frequency to discuss teachers' needs and provide instructional support. During pre-planning, teachers will attend two trainings: "Unpacking Standards and Identifying Task Alignment and Complexity" and "Departmental WICOR Strategy Showcase". During the school year, administration, instructional coaches, and department heads will closely monitor and provide feedback to teachers for culturally relevant, high-quality standards-based instruction and implementation of WICOR strategies in daily lessons.

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.

The school builds a positive school culture by involving all stakeholders to be an active participant in the school community. Our school has a School Advisory Council that meets monthly to discuss school improvement topics. This committee consists of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. In addition, we have a PTSA that meets monthly as well to discuss school and students' needs and how the PTSA can support teachers and help students meet their academic goals and achieve academic success. Our PTSA is currently made up of parents, students, and administrators.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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