

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Steinbrenner 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Ewell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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 (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	22%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

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.

Steinbrenner High School will be among the top-performing high schools in Florida

Provide the school's vision statement.

Steinbrenner High School will provide a rigorous course of study for students served in all programs

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
Ewell, Tiffany	Principal	<p>“The Principal, High School, directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of a public High School site. The Principal 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.”</p>
Gerhardt, Ben	Assistant Principal	<p>“The Assistant Principal 1, High School will assist with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a high school.”</p> <p>Mr. Gerhart created the Warrior of Worth program which allows teachers to recognize students doing good deeds around the school.</p>
Clemmons, Holly	Assistant Principal	<p>“The Assistant Principal 1, High will assist with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a high school.”</p> <p>Ms. Clemmons works with the warrior M3 program to support at-risk students with tier 1 and 2 interventions, to improve their academic and behavioral standing.</p>
Dillon, Calvin	Teacher, K-12	<p>Mr. Dillon is the English Department head, an Instructional Coach, and is actively involved in the SAC Committee.</p>
Puskas, Marie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Ms. Puskas is a math teacher, an Instructional Coach, Algebra 1 PLC leader, and SAC Chair.</p>
Savino, Jaclyn	Assistant Principal	<p>“The Assistant Principal 2, High School, will assist with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a High school.”</p> <p>Ms. Savino creates a master schedule to address the specific student needs, also aligned with instructional priorities and state standards. She allocates the units appropriately and manages highstakes testing. Additionally, she designs courses of study to increase college readiness.</p>
Garcia-Blanchard, Brandi	Assistant Principal	<p>“The Assistant Principal 1, High School will assist with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of a high school.”</p> <p>Ms. Garcia-Blanchard is in charge of Rtl and MTSS.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Tiffany Ewell

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.*

5

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

127

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 (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 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	0	609	646	597	639	2491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	23	37	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	53	39	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	28	37	46	124
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	35	40	31	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14

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	0	0	0	0	0

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

Sunday 9/20/2020

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	600	649	606	580	2435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	30	40	35	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	18	19	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	67	83	57	236
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	63	34	13	184

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	29	44	41	27	141

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600	649	606	580	2435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	30	40	35	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	18	19	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	67	83	57	236
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	63	34	13	184

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	29	44	41	27	141

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	80%	56%	56%	74%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	54%	51%	58%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	41%	42%	42%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	73%	49%	51%	73%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	59%	48%	48%	61%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	45%	54%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	85%	69%	68%	85%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	75%	73%	88%	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	79%	55%	24%	55%	24%
	2018	77%	53%	24%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	78%	53%	25%	53%	25%
	2018	76%	52%	24%	53%	23%
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	84%	66%	18%	67%	17%
2018	82%	62%	20%	65%	17%
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	94%	73%	21%	70%	24%
2018	89%	70%	19%	68%	21%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	63%	-3%	61%	-1%
2018	55%	63%	-8%	62%	-7%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	57%	20%	57%	20%
2018	72%	56%	16%	56%	16%
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	31	43	44	31	41	47	54	68		89	38
ELL	51	42	50	45	41		57			100	40
ASN	92	67		86	64		100	100		100	85
BLK	69	68	56	45	40		67	91		96	28

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	76	62	55	69	54	53	85	97		95	57
MUL	90	61		79	79		87	100		100	68
WHT	80	59	51	75	60	52	85	93		96	68
FRL	61	52	46	58	49	48	70	90		89	51
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	25	42	37	32	36	29	39	58		89	13
ELL	45	38	33	45	36	42	52	50		73	
ASN	86	62		73	58		88	86		100	83
BLK	61	54	68	50	43	46	77	77		93	44
HSP	74	58	48	63	47	42	80	85		95	62
MUL	90	61		75	53		95	96		94	67
WHT	79	63	52	74	55	51	84	90		97	61
FRL	63	56	50	55	46	49	71	77		86	45
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	24	28	23	35	37	37	33	60		75	26
ELL	30	31	25	50	44		53	53		84	38
ASN	83	60		84	71		95	92		94	82
BLK	45	38	26	50	44	32	75	63		85	38
HSP	72	57	44	73	61	64	82	84		95	64
MUL	75	71	60	68	54		80	91		85	59
WHT	77	61	44	75	63	55	87	91		95	66
FRL	56	46	34	59	52	49	74	73		85	49

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	71
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	782
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	55
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	87
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	62
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	70
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	83
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	72
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	61
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.

Mathematics learning gains for the lower 25%, while having improved over the prior year by 5%, is the lowest data performance measure. The SWD, HSP, and WHT ESSA subgroups increased over the previous year by 18%, 11%, and 1%, respectively; however, learning gains for the lowest 25% of students classified as Free and Reduced Lunch went down 1%.

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

Steinbrenner saw a 1% decrease in ELA learning gains. According to the ESSA subgroup data, ELA learning gains were equivalent, with Multi-Racial students and White students' achievement went down 4% overall.

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.

ELA Achievement had the largest gap when compared to the state average -- they were above the state average by 24% overall. The two ESSA subgroups that did not increase their ELA achievement were Multi-Racial students, who scored equivalent to the previous year, and students on Free and Reduced Lunch, whose scores reduced by 2%. The ESSA group with the largest gain were Black students, who raised their overall achievement by 8%.

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

Mathematics learning gains increased by 7% over the previous year. Mathematics teachers identified trends in previous years' data for each category of FSA and focused on improvement of the lowest performing skills.

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

A potential area of concern is the number of juniors that are currently below 90% attendance. Attendance is paramount for success, especially in an academically rigorous year such as junior year.

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

1. Improving the College and Career acceleration rate.
2. Improving the mathematics learning gains of the lower quartile.
3. Focus on the social emotional well-being of the students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Positively impact school culture by providing all students access to academic, social, and emotional support through a diverse system of school-wide mentoring and student-initiated programs. It is not enough to engage students with rigor in the classroom; they must have their social and emotional needs met and feel supported and resilient at school as well.

Measurable Outcome: We want to increase the 4-year graduate rate for both at-risk and standard diploma students, increase the attendance rate, and monitor students with a GPA below 2.0. These factors inhibit the potential of these students and addressing their social and emotional needs as well as the academic is essential to educating the whole child.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of the Warrior M3 Mentoring program coupled with activities related to Start With Hello and other student-run social-emotional programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Warrior M3 program specifically targets at-risk students, starting freshmen year, to address attendance and GPA issues before they begin or as they are beginning. The students are given a teacher mentor and meet with the mentor once a week to discuss attendance, grades, study habits, and the teacher is a safe space for the student. Start with Hello week unifies the school and brings awareness to the community we are building at Steinbrenner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with 5-10 students quarterly to monitor how effective mentoring programs are on campus at meeting the social, emotional and academic needs of students.
2. Regular reporting of results of meetings to administration
3. Coordination of Start With Hello programs through the guidance department

Person Responsible Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student achievement will increase when students have access to rigorous tasks and assignments aligned with grade-level literacy and content area standards in every classroom. Students are only successful when literacy is supported across all curricula so that they can learn to transfer the skills necessary for success. Lessons must all include rigorous engaging tasks that align with curriculum standards and ensure the students are responsible for their own learning.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the second semester, 80% of students will be college ready in mathematics as measured by state testing, and the college and career acceleration rate will be 78%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jaclyn Savino (jaclyn.savino@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: ILT and PLC time will be utilized to maximize common assessments and examination of student data to improve instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: ILT and PLCs are proven research-based approaches that have been implemented nationally and have been encouraged by the district.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student data will be collected and examined throughout the year to determine achievement or rigorous tasks through the ILT/PLC process.
2. Teachers will collaborate on assessments and lessons resulting from analysis of student performance data, specifically targeting students in Q1 and Q4 to ensure that students are engaged in rigorous tasks in each classroom and are growing and learning, as demonstrated by achieving learning gains, however those are measured in each context.
3. Core ILT and administrative leadership teams will meet to discuss the feedback from ILT/PLC group meetings, and determine areas of need with respect to teachers' professional development.

Person Responsible Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

-

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We have a supportive community, which includes a very active PTSA and parent members of SAC. We have parent volunteers present on campus weekly and amass hundreds of volunteer hours. The parents and students are given a voice in directing school-based decisions and implement initiatives related to student safety, wellness, and guidance on more academic endeavors such as standardized test preparation.

Steinbrenner offers ServSafe certification through the culinary program, personal trainer certification (NASM) through the Athletic Training STEM program, and multiple Microsoft Office certifications through the Career and Technical Education department. Multiple colleges visit the campus throughout the year to discuss characteristics of potential students. Students are also offered opportunities to visit Career and Technical Centers.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00