Newsome High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Newsome High School

16550 FISHHAWK BLVD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Katarzyna "Katie" Rocha

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	20%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * 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

Newsome High School

16550 FISHHAWK BLVD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	18%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

Our mission is to provide a safe and supportive environment that will promote lifelong learning and prepare students to become productive members of society. Newsome High School will provide experiences and knowledge needed to succeed in a rapidly changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Joe E. Newsome High School will be one of the top three high schools in Hillsborough county as measured by daily attendance rate, graduation rate, and FSA scores.

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
Rocha, Katie	Principal	
Peacock, Richard	Assistant Principal	
Lindstrom, Paul	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Chera	Assistant Principal	
Radebaugh, Grant	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/8/2020, Katarzyna "Katie" Rocha

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.*
7

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.*
11

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	20%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	710	819	765	750	3044
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	30	34	61	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	34	34	142
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	19	28	6	109
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	18	26	7	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	55	42	0	142
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	50	4	0	56

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	26	23	33	33	115

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

Monday 6/8/2020

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	711	828	776	736	3051
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	40	60	89	226
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	45	41	43	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	94	101	94	317
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	59	49	38	205

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	33	51	54	65	203

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	711	828	776	736	3051
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	40	60	89	226
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	45	41	43	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	94	101	94	317
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	59	49	38	205

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	33	51	54	65	203

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	78%	56%	56%	76%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	51%	62%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	41%	42%	55%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	74%	49%	51%	71%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	54%	48%	48%	56%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	45%	41%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	82%	69%	68%	80%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	75%	73%	91%	74%	70%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey spans the title row above the Indicator table.

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	79%	55%	24%	55%	24%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	53%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	76%	53%	23%	53%	23%
	2018	77%	52%	25%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	82%	66%	16%	67%	15%
2018	79%	62%	17%	65%	14%
Compare	3%				

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	90%	73%	17%	70%	20%
2018	89%	70%	19%	68%	21%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	63%	-8%	61%	-6%
2018	51%	63%	-12%	62%	-11%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	57%	23%	57%	23%
2018	75%	56%	19%	56%	19%
Compare		5%			

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	41	49	45	49	49	41	61	61		98	40
ELL	32	52	52	70	54	33	47			60	
ASN	83	63		85	63		85	95		96	78
BLK	63	56	48	55	34	35	69	85		96	48
HSP	76	64	53	72	57	56	76	88		95	67
MUL	75	66	50	71	50		78	87		100	48
WHT	80	64	60	76	55	55	85	90		100	71
FRL	57	55	49	60	57	50	65	77		96	60
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	36	52	46	43	52	34	46	68		86	35
ELL	41	58	61	42	60		40				
ASN	91	74		74	52		96	85		91	67
BLK	65	61	57	56	55	38	65	83		93	48
HSP	72	65	61	67	50	48	76	86		95	60
MUL	80	63	41	74	56		85	83		100	63
WHT	79	66	52	72	58	60	80	92		97	68
FRL	54	58	51	52	53	42	62	81		92	41

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	32	47	49	44	47	35	59	67		90	34
ELL	22	53	54	37	41	30	27				
ASN	82	67		83	76		94	95		100	92
BLK	57	57	58	46	51	42	55	76		98	47
HSP	67	57	48	63	48	30	71	88		96	66
MUL	76	73	69	70	61	30	85	91		100	63
WHT	79	63	58	74	57	44	83	92		97	66
FRL	55	57	52	51	44	35	50	83		93	49

(2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS)

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	773
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	81
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	59
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	68
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	69
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	74
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	62
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 shows the lowest performance is math learning gains of the lowest 25%, which regressed 3%. Although we did lose 3% of learning gains this year, in the 17-18 school year math learning gains of the lowest 25% actually rose by 14%, so the overall performance of this quartile has improved over the last three years.

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

While the math learning gains of the bottom quartile showed the greatest decline from the prior year, overall there has been an 11% gain in this area over the last three years. High-impact teachers have been moved to work with high-needs students and additional tutoring opportunities allow students to work with high-impact teachers outside the classroom.

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

The greatest gap when compared to the state average has been in ELA and Math achievement. Newsome data is significantly higher in both categories because of the specific pairing of higher achieving staff with high-needs students, ample tutoring opportunities, and a school culture of high achievement.

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

Student acceleration showed the most improvement, with a 4 point increase in the area of college and career. 69% of students pursued industry certification or completed an AP or dual enrollment classes.

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

Even though we did not have an ESSA category below 41%, there are two areas of concern:
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities - 53%
Federal Index - English Language Learners - 51%

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

1. Improve overall achievement in ELA and Math for bottom quartile students
2. Increase the learning gains for all students 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 students in ELA and Math
3. Analyze data to find students capable of accelerated coursework and place them appropriately
4. Collect and analyze data to create plans to increase academic achievement of our Students with Disabilities
5. Collect and analyze data to create plans to increase academic achievement of our English Language Learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase awareness of instructional impact by implementing formative assessments before, during or after a lesson to remediate, differentiate and extend learning for all students that perform on levels 1-5.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to see learning gains for all students when comparing previous FSA and EOC scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie Rocha (katie.rocha@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are using formative assessments and technological instructional strategies learned during e-learning to drive intentional and responsive instruction to increase our students academic progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe using formative assessments and technological instructional strategies learned during e-learning will equip our staff with the data and tools necessary to provide effective and appropriate instruction to ensure our student's mastery of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

-Instructional leadership team will create professional development based on survey results given to instructional personnel to evaluate their areas of need.
-Professional Development will be differentiated based on the survey results that indicate individual teacher need and progress.
-Professional development will address the four critical components of differentiated instruction, content, process, product and environment to ensure student progress across all content areas.

Person Responsible	Katie Rocha (katie.rocha@hcps.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Collaboration with administration, staff and faculty to build trust and implement a unified vision.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to include more stakeholders (faculty, staff, administration) in developing trust and a unified vision. We will see an increase in positive responses on the ASQi survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie Rocha (katie.rocha@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership development will be used by including more stakeholders in decision making process, which will build trust and create a unified vision.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We selected this strategy by analyzing our ASQi results. Although our ASQi scores were above the district average, we believe we can make an impact to improve our school's culture and climate by implementing this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

-Summer leadership team and Instructional leadership team are comprised of instructional volunteers that have equal opportunity to voice their opinions, disaggregate data, share their expertise and lead initiatives.

Person Responsible	Katie Rocha (katie.rocha@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Although Newsome has no ESSA category below 41%, Students With Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL) remain student groups of concern. These students will benefit to an even greater extent from the improved instructional practices outlined in Area of Focus #1. In conjunction with this, department heads and school administrators will be conducting regular formative learning walks to document best practices in utilization of standards aligned objectives and related on-level work, formative assessments in every stage of instruction to assess student learning, and differentiation strategies ensuring all students make academic gains. These Learning Walks will serve not only to provide school wide data but also specific constructive and formative feedback to teachers to support their professional development. New technology is also available through our learning platforms to assist teachers in scaffolding work to support reading and language development, such as the accessibility checker and the immersive reader in Canvas.

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.

Newsome partners with the community and has an active PTSA which ensure two-way communication is open and available so that the ideas, needs and concerns of all stakeholders can be heard and included in decision making. Likewise, the community is very supportive of student extracurricular activities, creating a robust school culture outside of the classroom as well as in. Within faculty, the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) represents all departments and actively seeks input from every faculty member to assess needs and receive input in determining goals toward professional growth to support student learning. Professional Learning Communities are leveraged to support these goals and progress monitored using data reported on the PLC logs as a metric.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00