Hillsborough County Public Schools

Wharton High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wharton High School

20150 BRUCE B DOWNS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Rowan   Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

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)	83%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Wharton High School

20150 BRUCE B DOWNS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide students with a meaningful education that develops creative, productive and responsible students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will reach their maximum potential, graduate high school, and be prepared for lifelong success.

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
Rowan, Michael	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities at Wharton High School. Also, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/2/2018, Michael Rowan

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.*
0

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.*
13

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)	83%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560	504	515	482	2061
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	152	181	142	647
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	27	14	10	73
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	132	117	99	505
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	100	56	51	331

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	12	12	12	5	41

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

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	576	573	553	606	2308
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	110	78	105	373
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	163	113	90	464
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	154	147	77	462
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	129	164	137	89	519

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	576	573	553	606	2308
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	110	78	105	373
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	163	113	90	464
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	154	147	77	462
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	129	164	137	89	519

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	52%	56%	56%	49%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	54%	51%	46%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	41%	42%	31%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	42%	49%	51%	48%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	42%	48%	48%	47%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	45%	35%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	69%	68%	57%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	75%	73%	67%	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	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	57%	66%	-9%	67%	-10%
2018	52%	62%	-10%	65%	-13%
Compare	5%				

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	74%	73%	1%	70%	4%
2018	70%	70%	0%	68%	2%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	63%	-33%	61%	-31%
2018	26%	63%	-37%	62%	-36%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	57%	-14%	57%	-14%
2018	54%	56%	-2%	56%	-2%
Compare		-11%			

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	20	33	26	25	46	38	31	47		83	
ELL	19	42	38	22	44	48	28	44		71	18
ASN	66	64	55	50	39		63	85		90	62
BLK	35	38	18	28	43	48	41	64		85	19
HSP	43	44	35	38	44	48	47	73		84	28
MUL	67	61		48	37		71	90		88	39
WHT	72	57	37	59	43	39	85	90		91	51
FRL	36	40	27	30	40	44	44	61		81	18
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	27	38	23	21	26	26	23	44		81	7
ELL	23	36	22	28	37	32	25	55		73	28
ASN	71	60		62	57		71	92		94	61
BLK	38	50	42	32	35	25	39	58		87	17
HSP	46	43	22	40	39	32	48	61		82	34
MUL	58	48		63	31		69	90		97	36
WHT	70	54	26	66	53	48	75	85		92	54
FRL	36	42	29	34	35	30	38	60		82	24

	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	17	32	28	18	30	38	21	26		66	19
ELL	17	27	18	26	42	28	40	26		63	44
ASN	70	53		70	66		85	86		94	81
BLK	30	35	28	30	37	36	42	55		81	16
HSP	43	42	22	42	45	29	53	52		81	37
MUL	56	50		50	40	31	61	89		81	31
WHT	64	57	42	63	53	40	70	85		95	54
FRL	31	36	26	33	39	32	43	48		77	22

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	60
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	45
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	47
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
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 showing the lowest performance is the ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile. The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile is 29%, compared to 41% in the district, which is a decrease of 3% from the year prior. Ninth grade students were placed into classes with students of all achievement levels, where teachers were encouraged to differentiate instruction to meet all learners' needs. However, this lessened opportunities for explicit reading instruction.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from prior year is the FSA Geometry EOC percent of student scoring a 3 or higher. The school's percent of students receiving a 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC decreased from the prior year by 11%, from 54% to 35%. Students were place into Geometry classes with students of different achievement levels.

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 learning gains for bottom quartile students showed the biggest gap compared to the district. ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile was 29%, which is 16% below the district. This is consistent with prior years.

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

The Early Warning Indicator category of attendance is the data component that showed most improvement. We increased attendance for students' attendance below 90% by more than 60% when comparing to the prior years. Attendance was closely monitored and consequences were given.

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

Students with two or more indicators will continue to be a focus. Administration has implemented new strategies for the 2020-2021 school year to improve overall behavior.

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

1. Overall EOC/FSA gains
2. AP/CTE gains
3. Planning with a focus on active learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement has decreased on the Geometry and ELA FSA's by 11% and 1% respectively. For ELA FSA, the lowest 25th of students has decreased by 2% from the prior year. While Algebra FSA EOC achievement has increased by 4% from the previous year, achievement is still 33% below the district. Teachers will be provided professional development and data analysis to improve lesson plans in PLCs. To increase student achievement on EOC and FSAs teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development and strategies to create lesson plans that focus on ensuring student learning for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2020-2021 school year, FSA ELA percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 4%, from 52% in 2019 to 56%. In the 2020-2021 school year, Algebra 1 FSA EOC percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 4%, from 30% in 2019 to 34%. In the 2020-2021 school year, Geometry FSA EOC percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 4%, from 43 in 2019 to 47% . In the 2020-2021 school year, FSA ELA learning gains from the lowest quartile will increase by 6%, from 48% in 2019 to 54%. In the 2020-2021 school year, Math FSA EOC learning gains from the lowest quartile will increase by 4%, from 44% in 2019 to 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Multiple cross-content strategies, such as note taking, text marking, and other CRISS techniques, will me taught through professional development to teachers so that they can implement in classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing these tools, teacher will be able to support the bottom quartile through all content areas so that we would see improvement in all FSAs and EOCs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development training will be provided during pre-planning, and ongoing throughout the school year. PD will cover engagement strategies and closing the learning gaps. Coaches will support teacher in
developed lessons based on PD, and will complete a coaching cycle for teachers needing additional support. Walk-through data will be collected and reviewed by department heads, coaches and administration during
leadership team meetings.
2. PLC's will meet monthly to plan for active engagement, and review data. Monthly meeting attendance will be reported to leadership team.
3. Students will be identified for additional pull-out support by subject area teachers and a bottom quartile mentor program.
4. Students will receive additional curriculum-based support through a peer tutoring program.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Case managers will encourage all ESE students on case loads to attend ELP and/or homework help for additional academic support.

Person Responsible	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to increase FSA/EOC test scores, teachers will develop and implement lesson plans with a focus on active learning strategies. Strategies will increase differentiation within classrooms and enhance overall student engagement of all learners.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will demonstrate active learning strategies within lessons and this will be evident through walk-throughs by administration, department heads, instructional coaches, and peers. The walk-through data collected will be utilized through teacher reflection in PLCs and student achievement will be measurable through FSA/EOC scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be provided multiple opportunities to enhance instructional pedagogy with active learning strategies through monthly professional development. Teachers will also receive collaborative supports through model classrooms which will allow teachers to observe strategies directly and implement within their own classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies are teacher-centered, teacher-selected, and driven by teacher choice. This allows for "best practices" to be shared collectively among the instructional staff to enhance all student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development training will be provided monthly to introduce active learning strategies. PLC's will meet monthly to plan for active engagement, and review data. Monthly meeting attendance will be reported to leadership team.
2. Model classrooms will allow teachers inability to observe active learning strategies and apply them within their classrooms.
3. Teachers will have opportunities to participate in ghost walks, observing peers' classrooms when not instructing, to further develop their own practice and enhance student learning.

Person Responsible	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Providing students opportunities to deepen Advanced Placement learning, explore career and vocational programs, as well as an avenue to obtain the necessary skills needed to prepare them for the workforce.
Measurable Outcome:	Student awareness of career and vocational opportunities will be enhanced through multiple data sources. In addition, AP exam pass rate will improve by 41 points, and industry certifications will increase by 15 points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will attain preparatory higher level thinking skills in pre AP courses. In addition, students will have increased opportunities to earn industry certifications through additional courses. Students will also be provided vocational opportunities through a partnership program and vocational fair.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By placing students in Pre AP Courses, there will be a higher probability of increasing the AP exam pass rate. By increasing course opportunities to attain industry certifications, the number of certifications earned will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. College bound students will be placed in pre AP courses to better prepare them for AP curriculum.
2. Students will be provided more opportunities to obtain certifications through CTE courses.
3. Vocational interest surveys will help identify students' interest.
4. Career-minded students will have an opportunity to explore career options through a vocational fair.

Person Responsible	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

For our ELL students will be provided with college and career exploratory options with appropriate language support. i.e. monolingual students will be partnered with bilingual students.

Person Responsible	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Ongoing communication is a foundation to building positive relationships with our parents, families, and stakeholders. This communication includes access to the school's website, Parent Link, Canvas, The PAW, as well as other forms of social media, like Twitter, and YouTube videos.
The school also encourages parent involvement through voluntarism and parent-teacher conference nights. Conference nights are scheduled throughout the school year, so that parents and families can have face-to-face or virtual interaction with teachers to discuss progress and see work samples of their child's mastery.

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: Professional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00