Sickles High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sickles High School

7950 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Krista Luloff   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	41%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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

Sickles High School

7950 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33626

[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	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

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.

To provide an education and the supports that enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students for life.

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
Freitas, Mary	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of a public High School site. Demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Luloff, Krista	Assistant Principal	Assists with instructional, administrative, and operational leadership.
Lewandowski, Gregory	Assistant Principal	Assists with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Krista Luloff

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.*
8

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
133

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)	41%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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	527	637	632	560	2356
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	42	50	53	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	44	39	37	166
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	14	3	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	11	4	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	73	48	33	208
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	4	18	7	77

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	29	35	45	50	159

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

Friday 9/4/2020

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	637	645	577	598	2457
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	57	32	38	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	10	11	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	60	42	36	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	26	73	45	46	190

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	637	645	577	598	2457
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	57	32	38	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	46	39	65	216
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	60	42	36	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	48	58	35	229

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	73	45	46	190

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	73%	56%	56%	67%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	51%	61%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	41%	42%	50%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	64%	49%	51%	72%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	57%	48%	48%	66%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	45%	49%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	69%	68%	68%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	75%	73%	86%	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

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	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%
	2018	68%	53%	15%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	53%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	82%	66%	16%	67%	15%
2018	72%	62%	10%	65%	7%
Compare		10%			

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	84%	73%	11%	70%	14%
2018	89%	70%	19%	68%	21%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	63%	-11%	61%	-9%
2018	46%	63%	-17%	62%	-16%
Compare		6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	57%	10%	57%	10%
2018	68%	56%	12%	56%	12%
Compare		-1%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	46	29	33	40	31	46	70		76	24
ELL	34	53	47	45	49	39	57	55		95	49
ASN	83	69		88	73		95	91		91	87
BLK	46	50	45	38	44	27	53	68		97	43
HSP	61	58	46	53	53	41	76	78		94	48
MUL	81	58		69	50		96	87		86	63
WHT	82	70	58	75	61	43	88	93		97	63
FRL	54	57	46	49	53	35	74	78		93	46
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	24	39	38	42	38	31	31	51		84	15
ELL	30	47	45	40	53	39	49	75		92	40
ASN	82	64	45	81	53		84	100		100	67
BLK	45	37	21	62	56	30	52	82		96	47
HSP	57	63	61	52	49	41	62	86		95	48
MUL	69	59	50	56	52		71	95		100	55
WHT	78	63	49	71	53	41	81	92		95	61
FRL	52	53	52	48	46	36	57	82		95	44

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	28	43	43	42	51	35	37	64		67	29
ELL	20	45	43	46	58	39	29	59		74	31
ASN	85	85		90	79		88	93		100	83
BLK	59	53	27	67	65	50	57	89		82	43
HSP	54	53	46	63	61	45	57	78		87	52
MUL	69	50		82	81		70	89		90	62
WHT	77	67	61	76	67	52	77	91		91	59
FRL	47	51	45	58	62	46	51	77		79	39

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	66
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	728
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	53
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	85
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	60
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	74
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	73
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	58
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.

BQ Learning Gains Math (39%). After reviewing scheduling procedures, some students could be placed at a more appropriate level based on ability. Struggling students need more supports such as small groups and tutoring.

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

BQ Learning Gains ELA dropped from 54% to 49%. Improved student placement and increased supports are need for struggling students.

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.

BQ Learning Gains Math (39% to 45%). Improved student placement and increased supports are need for struggling students.

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

Science Biology EOC scores increased from 73% to 84%. 9th grade students with level 1 reading were placed in Physical Science rather than Biology. Biology has much vocabulary to learn and can be difficult for struggling readers. Although the students were enrolled in Physical Science, the teacher also introduced biological concepts and vocabulary to prepare the students for the following year.

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

Students with disabilities 43% Federal Index

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

1. BQ Learning Gains Math 39%
2. BQ Learning Gains ELA 49%
3. SWD BQ Learning Gains Math 29%
4. SWD BQ Learning Gains ELA 49%
5. SWD Science 46%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	in order to close the achievement gap, we will use cohesive, interdisciplinary, standards based lesson planning to improve student learning gains for our bottom quartile, our lowest performing group. Additionally, this will help teachers differentiate to better support our students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our bottom quartlie learning gains in Math to 45% and 55% for ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gregory Lewandowski (gregory.lewandowski@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based, data driven lesson planning PLC's
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using formative and summative assessment data from PLC groups, we will be able to identify areas of need and strategies that have been proven to improve student performance and increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Training during pre-planning by grade level to address learning losses due to elearining transition.

Person Responsible	Samantha Bielitz (samantha.bielitz@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

During pre-planning, teachers will be trained on using instructional planning tools to better know and analyze student data. Data will be used to drive instruction and differentiate lessons to meet the needs of all students. PLCs will be more data focused. The master schedule will be created with equity in mind to ensure that struggling students receive quality instruction.

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.

Student government plans through a lens of inclusion and works to make all students feel welcome. Over the past few years, they have focused on making our 9th graders feel more a part of the school. We do an 8th grade day so the middle school students can come and preview the school. During 9th grade open house, our SGA members are out and about answering questions and helping students find their way around. We host a 9th grade only pep rally at the beginning of the year. Our SAC and PTSA give regular feedback to school leadership. Our PTSA has changed as our demographic has changed. They work to provide incentives that do not require students to purchase or spend money to take advantage of. We have a strong business partnership with many local businesses. Our TTD is starting a new teacher group to help new teachers become familiar with and feel welcome at our school. Our Sunshine committee plans activities to celebrate milestones among the faculty.

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: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00