

The School Board of Highlands County

Sebring High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	29

Sebring High School

3514 KENILWORTH BLVD, Sebring, FL 33870

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~shs/>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Ervin A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Highlands 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	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Sebring High School

3514 KENILWORTH BLVD, Sebring, FL 33870

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~shs/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

In four years at Sebring High School, our students will obtain a quality education in a nurturing environment that prepares them for success in college and career. Our students will be encouraged to become productive citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students Are Here to Succeed

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mann, Angie	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher and 2 periods of Science Coach
Barnett, Julie	Teacher, K-12	CDE and Externing Teacher
Ervin, Kimberly	Principal	
Sherley, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Caton, Pat	Math Coach	Math Coach and Math Teacher
Colbert, Mark	Teacher, K-12	JROTC Instructor
Delgado, Jenn	Curriculum Resource Teacher	MTSS Teacher
DeWitt, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	AVID Elective Teacher
Dolak, Stefanie	Reading Coach	
Giordano, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Khang, Pang	School Counselor	
McLeod, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher
Van der kaay, Ruth	Teacher, K-12	English Department Chair
Wolfe, Rhoda	Teacher, K-12	Performing Fine Arts Department Chair
Ridgeway, Donald	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/30/2021, Kimberly Ervin A

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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,643

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

13

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	525	416	397	315	1653
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	115	90	124	466
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	27	14	9	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	134	108	61	415
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	42	33	27	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	86	69	50	314
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	72	43	37	245
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	185	131	114	77	507

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	44	17	9	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	13	9	4	52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	321	280	244	273	1118
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	5	27	137
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	19	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	37	40	49	215
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	66	30	15	185

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	30	20	6	12	68

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	81	54	39	11	185
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	321	280	244	273	1118
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	5	27	137
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	19	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	37	40	49	215
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	66	30	15	185

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	30	20	6	12	68

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	81	54	39	11	185
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	44%	56%	51%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	46%	51%	48%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	35%	42%	36%	34%	44%
Math Achievement				42%	45%	51%	47%	47%	51%
Math Learning Gains				29%	44%	48%	35%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26%	44%	45%	24%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				58%	56%	68%	58%	55%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				59%	65%	73%	66%	65%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	53%	46%	7%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	50%	43%	7%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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
2021					
2019	55%	54%	1%	67%	-12%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	63%	-5%	70%	-12%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	30%	52%	-22%	61%	-31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	48%	55%	-7%	57%	-9%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Common Lit for ELA, iReady for Algebra, District baseline assessments for Biology and US History.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	32	31	9	18	17	17	21		62	10
ELL	14	47	38	6	15		23			85	18
ASN	77	58								100	93
BLK	25	40	39	8	14	13	21	27		84	27
HSP	41	36	22	27	21	16	51	34		79	44

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	67	71		27						73	
WHT	55	49	38	40	22	18	57	52		81	56
FRL	38	39	30	25	21	19	40	38		77	37
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	18	40	38	40	39	38	26	31		59	14
ELL	8	33		30			20			73	21
ASN	87	60		45			73			100	83
BLK	31	38	30	26	27	31	33	40		81	30
HSP	47	49	38	36	18	16	55	53		77	35
MUL	52	50		53	36			36		69	
WHT	58	54	43	49	35	27	64	66		79	63
FRL	39	45	37	35	27	24	47	51		78	37
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	26	40	32	24	25		26	63		40	14
ELL	20	54								64	
ASN	94	77		100	67		100	83		82	
BLK	33	46	40	24	26	13	43	51		65	19
HSP	43	42	30	42	36	26	49	65		78	45
MUL	50	52		50	30		40			80	25
WHT	56	49	37	53	37	28	63	68		76	54
FRL	42	46	36	40	34	23	50	60		71	37

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Learning gains for the lowest quartile in ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Algebra I proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains for the lowest quartile.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Teacher capacity and support for students in the lowest quartile to close the achievement gap. Fidelity and commitment to the PLC planning process.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Proficiency in ELA.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Teacher capacity. Standards aligned curriculum and assignments. Teachers working together to plan and support each other.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teachers participating in weekly PLC planning process with like subject areas. Use of intervention materias in Algebra 1. Following district created curriculum maps. Math coach working with Algebra 1 teachers to model and provide them with feedback on their instructional practice.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Math coach training. Admin has attended new B,E.S.T standards training. Admin and Math Coach attending PLC planning with teachers.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Intensive math classes for seniors that have not passed the Alg 1 EOC for graduation. Study hall support for students to receive additional tutoring. Part-time math coach. Use of IPG to guide feedback to teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In reviewing the Algebra I EOC data from 2021, 24% of Sebring High Students were proficient. This is -24% below the district average and -24% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

At least 41% of our students will score proficient on the Algebra I EOC to work toward closing the gap between the school and the district and state.

Monitoring:

iReady data. Math Coach modeling and giving feedback to classroom teachers. Provide immediate reteaching based on formative classroom assessment. Teachers will monitor formative and summative assessment classroom data. Students in our lowest quartile based on 20-21 data will be monitored through our MTSS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Ridgeway (ridgewad@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Using formative and summative data to drive instruction.

Using standards aligned instruction - use district created curriculum maps PLCs

Strategy:

Spring Math curriculum for struggling students identify areas of weakness from iReady. Boot camps before Algebra 1 EOC.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By using the formative and summative data teachers will know what skills students have mastered and the ones that they need more support in. By using standards aligned instruction, you are assured that students are covering the material on the Algebra I EOC and learning the skills they need. Teachers are more successful when they have the opportunity to meet with each other and discuss what students need to know, how they are going to instruct, how they will know when students have mastered the standards, and what they will do if students don't reach mastery. By having our math coach work with teachers, she is able to provide them with immediate feedback to help improve instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide time each week for Alg 1 teachers to meet and collaborate using the PLC planning model.

Person Responsible

Pat Caton (catonp@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Schedule level 1 and low level 2 students into Alg 1A sections.

Person Responsible

Donald Ridgeway (ridgewad@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Use of research based supplemental materials to shrink skill gaps and accelerate learning. Spring Math.

Person Responsible

Donald Ridgeway (ridgewad@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Follow district created curriculum maps.

Person Responsible

Pat Caton (catonp@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Identify students in the lowest quartile from the 20-21 Alg 1 EOC data.

Person Responsible Donald Ridgeway (ridgewad@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Specifically analyze our progress monitoring data for our Students With Disabilities, our Black students, and our English Language Learners. We will use this data to determine if we are closing the achievement gaps for these sub groups to at least meet the 41% proficiency threshold as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act. We will provide interventions for students who are not having a positive response to instruction.

Person Responsible Donald Ridgeway (ridgewad@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus	Students who regularly attend school have a higher likely hood of staying on track towards graduation and are less likely to dropout. During the 20-21 SY thirty-five percent of our students attended school less than 90% of the time.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students attending school at least 90% of the time from 65% to 75%.
Monitoring:	Using Skyward reports, administrators will monitor the number of students who have amassed more than 5 un-excused absences in a 30-day period and/or 10 un-excused absences in a 90-day period.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Sherley (sherleyl@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Daily automated call outs when students are absent -Monthly SARC meetings -First Contact Letter -SARC Invitation -Attendance liaison -After 15 excused or un-excused absences a doctor's note is required -Informing parents of their students absence by the end of first period gives them the opportunity to get their child to school before it's counted as a whole-day absence -Meeting to discuss a plan of action to help remedy student's attendance issues. Meeting with the parents and students together to discover a potential underlying reason for the absences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Written documentation stating students have missed 5 school days in 30 calendar days keeps parents informed. -Written documentation stating students have missed 10 school days in 90 calendar days keeps parents informed. -When we are unable to make contact with parents or if other interventions are not successful, the attendance liaison will visit the home.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify at-risk students based on the 20-21 attendance data.

Person Responsible Jenn Delgado (delgadoj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

2. Meet with students identified as at-risk by the end of September.

Person Responsible Jenn Delgado (delgadoj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

3. Begin notification process by September. Begin SARC meetings by the beginning of October.

Person Responsible Laura Sherley (sherleyl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Specifically analyze our attendance data for our Students With Disabilities, our Black students, and our English Language Learners. We will use this data to determine if we are closing the achievement gaps for these sub groups to at least meet the 41% proficiency threshold as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act. We will provide attendance interventions for students whose attendance is not improving.

**Person
Responsible**

Laura Sherley (sherleyl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA proficiency dropped from 51% in 2019 to 48% in 2021. This is +3% above the district, but -3% below the State.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA proficiency from 48% in 2021 to 58% in 2022.

Monitoring:

- Common Lit assessments 3 times per year
- Formative assessments
- IPG walk-through data
- Course failure data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Ervin (ervink@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Common PLC planning time once per week
- Use of common formative assessments
- Immediate feedback provided to teachers around components of the ELA IPG
- Use of early warning system data related to course failures to identify students in need of extra support

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using the formative and summative data teachers will know what skills students have mastered and the ones that they need more support in. Teachers are more successful when they have the opportunity to meet with each other and discuss what students need to know, how they are going to instruct, how they will know when students have mastered the standards, and what they will do if students don't reach mastery. By having our literacy coach work with teachers, she is able to provide them with immediate feedback to help improve instruction. Using early warning system data helps identify students in need of additional support.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule a time for teachers to meet and collaborate using the PLC planning model.

Person Responsible Ruth Van der kaay (vanderkr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Schedule a time for Literacy Coach to observe classrooms using the ELA IPG and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible Stefanie Dolak (dolaks@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Schedule a time for teachers to review Common Lit data and formative assessment data.

Person Responsible Ruth Van der kaay (vanderkr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Pull early warning system data from 2021 to identify students in need of extra support this year.

Person Responsible Jenn Delgado (delgadoj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Specifically analyze our progress monitoring data for our Students With Disabilities, our Black students, and our English Language Learners. We will use this data to determine if we are closing the achievement gaps for these sub groups to at least meet the 41% proficiency threshold as defined by the Every Student

Succeeds Act. We will provide interventions for students who are not having a positive response to instruction.

Person Responsible Jenn Delgado (delgadoj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Biology proficiency dropped from 55% in 2019 to 51% in 2021. That is +2% above the district, but -10% below the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	61% of our students will be proficient on the 2022 Biology EOC.
Monitoring:	Biology progress monitoring assessments 2 times per year. Students outcomes on formative assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Ridgeway (ridgewad@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All teachers following district standards-aligned curriculum map - All biology teachers collaborating once per week using PLC planning model - Science coach modeling for classroom teachers and providing them with feedback around the components of the Science IPG
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards- aligned curriculum map keeps teachers on pace to cover important concepts by the end of the school year and focuses instruction around key standards in the Biology 1 curriculum - Teachers planning together ensures equity across classrooms and provides support for all teachers - Providing immediate feedback to teachers allows them to make adjustments to instruction and assignments in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

Planning a weekly PLC meeting time for all biology teachers to collaborate.

Person Responsible Angie Mann (manna@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Reviewing and sharing data from formative assessments and biology progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible Angie Mann (manna@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Science coach will conduct walk-throughs using Science IPG

Person Responsible Angie Mann (manna@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Specifically analyze our progress monitoring data for our Students With Disabilities, our Black students, and our English Language Learners. We will use this data to determine if we are closing the achievement gaps for these sub groups to at least meet the 41% proficiency threshold as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act. We will provide interventions for students who are not having a positive response to instruction.

Person Responsible Angie Mann (manna@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proficiency on the US History EOC dropped from 58% in 2019 to 40% in 2021. This -12% below the district and -23% below the State.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of the students taking the US History EOC will score a level three or above.
Monitoring:	US History baseline assessments from the district. Formative assessment data from classroom teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Giordano (giordanj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers will meet weekly to plan and collaborate and develop common formative assessments. - Literacy coach will conduct classroom walk-throughs using Social Studies IPG and provide immediate feedback to classroom teachers. - Formative assessment data will be used to determine mastery of standards and the need for reteaching - Planning together will allow teachers to share best practices and ensure equity between classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing feedback around the components of the IPG will help teachers improve instruction, engagement, and rigor. - The use of common formative assessments will allow teachers to have discussion around the same assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy coach scheduling walk-throughs using the IPG

Person Responsible Stefanie Dolak (dolaks@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will decide on a time each week to collaborate using the PLC planning model.

Person Responsible Laura Sherley (sherleyl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

During the PLC, teachers will agree upon formative assessment questions and keep a log of their meetings.

Person Responsible Stefanie Dolak (dolaks@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Specifically analyze our progress monitoring data for our Students With Disabilities, our Black students, and our English Language Learners. We will use this data to determine if we are closing the achievement gaps for these sub groups to at least meet the 41% proficiency threshold as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act. We will provide interventions for students who are not having a positive response to instruction.

Person Responsible Laura Sherley (sherleyl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our discipline data ranks in the very high category compared to other high schools in the state for the 2019-2020 school year. This year we were able to hold in-person code of conduct meetings for all grade levels to make sure that student are aware of school rules and consequences. We also met with our teachers to make sure that we are being consistent with infractions such as cell phones and dress code violations. Our deans meet twice a month with administration to look at data trends. We are working to educate our students on the dangers of vaping and the use of other illegal drugs on school campus. We are also working with local law enforcement to deter students from bringing illegal drugs on campus.

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.

Sebring High School utilizes numerous parent and stakeholder advisory groups to include the School Advisory Committee, Highlands International Baccalaureate Advanced Academic Partnership, Student Government, academic, extra- and co-curricular parent support groups (e.g., band boosters). We have over 30 clubs and organizations for students to be part of and hold a club "rush" day for students to get more information and join.

A system of regular communications with parents, students, teachers, school board members, and other community stakeholders is maintained via the Blackboard Connect system, progress reports/report cards, School Attendance Review Committee, teacher websites, teacher emails, school website, parent nights, college nights, college resource room, Skyward Parent Portal (online, web-based recording of grades and attendance with 24/7 access by staff, students, and parents), and Facebook.

Sebring High School welcomes parent and community volunteers. We have many community members that serve as mentors to our students. We have an excellent relationship with our local state college and businesses that allow our students to intern with them.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration ensures that opportunities for student, teacher, parent, and community members are in place.

SAC Committee ensures that parents, students, teachers, and community members have an opportunity to provide input into decisions made by the school.

Student Government ensures that student voices are heard and that they have input into school decisions. They also bring concerns to the attention of administrators.

Staff members build relationships with students and are many times the first to recognize if a student needs extra support or help.

Club sponsors support student groups on our campus that address student interests.

Guidance counselors and mental health therapists support our students by providing them the emotional support that they need.

College Coach provides support to students with their plans for after high school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00