

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tampa Bay Tech 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Tampa Bay Tech High School

6410 ORIENT RD, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ernestine Woody

Start Date for this Principal: 6/2/2020

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: A (67%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Tampa Bay Tech High School

6410 ORIENT RD, Tampa, FL 33610

[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;">78%</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;">87%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Tampa Bay Technical High School will maintain the highest standards of excellence for all students as they acquire career and academic knowledge to become life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tampa Bay Technical High School will provide a caring and educationally rigorous experience to develop successful students.

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
Ippolito, Michael	Principal	The Principal manages the operations of the school. Mr. Ippolito is responsible for ensuring the school runs smoothly, remains safe, and provides an excellent learning environment for its students.
Woody, Ernestine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
carmody, marissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Athletics and Facilities
Graff-McPherrren, Shea	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
ChatmanJohnson, Candace	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs
Conte, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Student Affairs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/2/2020, Ernestine Woody

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.*

4

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

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: A (67%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	564	569	530	441	2104
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	132	143	146	534
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	1	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	61	62	35	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	59	50	23	165

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	2	1	0	1	4

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

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	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	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
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	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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
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	65%	56%	56%	57%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	54%	51%	51%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	41%	42%	47%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	61%	49%	51%	50%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	48%	48%	43%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	45%	28%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	77%	69%	68%	70%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	75%	73%	78%	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	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	63%	53%	10%	53%	10%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	77%	66%	11%	67%	10%
2018	71%	62%	9%	65%	6%
Compare		6%			

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	81%	73%	8%	70%	11%
2018	75%	70%	5%	68%	7%
Compare		6%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	63%	-20%	61%	-18%
2018	36%	63%	-27%	62%	-26%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	57%	10%	57%	10%
2018	54%	56%	-2%	56%	-2%
Compare		13%			

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	22	32	32	48	59		44	69		100	61
ELL	48	62	60	58	54	55	59	50		100	67
ASN	88	62		89	44		94	91		100	83
BLK	55	53	51	51	49	41	70	78		100	69
HSP	73	67	63	69	57	61	81	79		100	77
MUL	71	60		74	69		85	79		100	91
WHT	74	63	46	71	59	50	88	90		95	69
FRL	62	57	51	58	52	45	74	78		99	70
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	20	31	40	32	33	36	39	38		100	42
ELL	33	43	55	45	32	27	61	36		100	73
ASN	83	68		94	64		100	90		100	95
BLK	52	50	45	37	37	30	65	69		97	58
HSP	66	54	50	60	48	22	76	78		98	73
MUL	67	48		64	64		90	71		100	67
WHT	78	63	60	72	60	75	79	85		96	80
FRL	57	51	46	48	43	31	70	72		97	65

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	36	37	20	21	12	46	47		92	36
ELL	24	39	44	39	41	24	39	47		91	69
AMI	82	64									
ASN	80	60		87	59		95	93		94	94
BLK	51	48	42	42	40	28	63	74		96	48
HSP	57	49	49	55	43	26	71	77		94	60
MUL	73	68	70	49	53	24	68	79		88	53
WHT	70	60	52	58	47	39	87	87		97	63
FRL	55	50	46	47	41	28	66	74		95	52

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	68
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	753
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	63
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

Native American Students	
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	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	73
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	79
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	71
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	66
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.

Students with disabilities had the lowest ELA achievement than their white counterparts. This was also evident in their ELA Learning Gains. These students need additional support in English and Reading.

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

Student Data demonstrates that there were gains in all categories in comparison to the previous year. The school made greater efforts to focus on standards based learning objectives. Teachers made sure students are aware of the learning objective and can express it verbally. The learning objective is posted on the board and students can explain how it connects to what they have been doing in class. The teachers created lesson plans with the standard in mind and reflected the objective for the lesson.

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.

Tampa Bay Tech's students showed the greatest gap in the lowest 25th percentile in Math in comparison to the state. Algebra 1 students struggled, however additional tutoring services will be offered this year.

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

Students showed great improvement on the Algebra EOC. Students received additional support through teacher support, tutoring, and enrichment.

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

Students showed great improvement on the Algebra EOC. Students received additional support through tutoring and enrichment.

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

1. SWD ELA Achievement
2. SWD ELA Learning Gains
3. SWD Math Achievement
4. Black Students ELA Achievement
5. Black Students Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We want to increase the number of students receiving accelerator points. Students attend TBT in order to receive certifications upon graduation. We want to improve the number of students taking AP courses and earning certifications.

Measurable Outcome: We will compare the number of students receiving accelerator points from 2018-2019 to 2029-2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ernestine Woody (ernestine.woody@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: TBT will provide opportunities for student practice in order to ensure they are learning the necessary skills and strategies to receive their certification. We will also encourage students to take more rigorous courses through dual enrollment and AP classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing accelerator points will improve the number of points the school receives for school grade.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Make list of students who have earned an accelerator point.
2. Make a list of students who are in AP/ Dual enrollment courses.
3. Identify students who are eligible to take a certification exam.
4. Ensure teachers are aware of the certification requirements.

Person Responsible Ernestine Woody (ernestine.woody@hcps.net)

5. Encourage students to take and pass their certification exams.

Person Responsible Ernestine Woody (ernestine.woody@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 work with students and teachers throughout the year. We will include the book study Unselfie. Phase one included department heads and the leadership team. The next step is to include a book study for the entire faculty.

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 steps to creating a positive school culture include investing in all of our students, building relationships with parents through Donuts for Dad and Muffins for Mom events. Our school encourages a shared vision through posting the vision in all classrooms, ensuring teachers post their objective, connecting the objective to the lesson and assessment, and following best teaching practices including higher order thinking questions and assessment.

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: Career & Technical Education				\$0.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			4221 - Tampa Bay Tech High School			\$0.00
		<i>Notes: Notes</i>				
Total:					\$0.00	