

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Armwood 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Armwood High School

12000 E US HIGHWAY 92, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dina Langston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 74% |
| 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 (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 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 | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Armwood High School

12000 E US HIGHWAY 92, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

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 9-12 | Yes | 78% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 75% |

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 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.

Believe, Succeed, Achieve

Provide the school's vision statement.

Armwood High School will work with our families and community to provide an atmosphere that challenges our students to be college and career ready.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Langston, Dina | Principal | The Principal is responsible for the instructional direction and vision of the school, inclusive to all programs and initiatives. The Principal will provide a common vision for the use of data based decision-making; shape a vision of academic success for all students; create a climate hospitable to education; cultivate leadership in others; manage people; review data and action plans; as well as improve school leadership. |
| Johnson, Matthew | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal is responsible for supporting the vision and instructional goals established, support teachers, participate in community/parent outreach, directly supervise and evaluate teachers and effective instruction and all other duties assigned by the Principal. The Assistant Principal(s), under the direction of the Principal, implement(s) and enforce(s) school board policies, administrative rules and regulations. In the absence of the Principal, the Assistant Principal(s) shall assume the duties and responsibilities of the Principal. The Assistant Principal(s) will work cooperatively with the District, support district-wide goals and initiatives, and be held directly accountable to the Principal. |
| Alfonso, Julie | Instructional Coach | Instructional literacy coach meets weekly with department heads and PLC leaders to support the vision and instructional goals established by the Principal. Support classroom teachers, creates and participates in staff development, assist in all areas requests and duties assigned by the Principal. |
| James, Stacey | Magnet Coordinator | Support Collegiate Academy students and classroom teachers, provides information and supports students in their college applications and career choices, recruits for the Magnet Program, and assist in all areas requests and duties assigned by the Principal. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Dina Langston

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.*

3

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

144

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,143

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

10

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

20

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 | 608 | 583 | 541 | 467 | 2199 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 167 | 214 | 166 | 704 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 42 | 56 | 26 | 151 |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 152 | 148 | 1 | 476 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 83 | 0 | 97 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 62 |

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 | 18 | 30 | 49 | 30 | 127 |

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 | 97 | 96 | 91 | 82 | 366 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 39 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/7/2021

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 | 0 | 579 | 551 | 482 | 492 | 2104 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 290 | 228 | 239 | 1038 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 33 | 16 | 8 | 87 |
| Course failure in ELA | 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 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 157 | 157 | 134 | 620 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 158 | 82 | 80 | 479 |

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 | 22 | 27 | 13 | 7 | 69 |

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 | |

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 | 579 | 551 | 482 | 492 | 2104 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 290 | 228 | 239 | 1038 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 33 | 16 | 8 | 87 |
| 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 | 172 | 157 | 157 | 134 | 620 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 158 | 82 | 80 | 479 |

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 | 22 | 27 | 13 | 7 | 69 |

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 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 | | | | 44% | 56% | 56% | 43% | 54% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 49% | 54% | 51% | 49% | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 41% | 42% | 45% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 31% | 49% | 51% | 32% | 48% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 34% | 48% | 48% | 39% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 25% | 45% | 45% | 30% | 45% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 62% | 69% | 68% | 65% | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 73% | 75% | 73% | 63% | 73% | 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 | 41% | 55% | -14% | 55% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 53% | -11% | 53% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |

| 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 | 59% | 66% | -7% | 67% | -8% |
| 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 | 71% | 73% | -2% | 70% | 1% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 15% | 63% | -48% | 61% | -46% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 34% | 57% | -23% | 57% | -23% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA-Achieve 3000

Mathematics, Biology, US History-District Assessment

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27 | 30 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21 | 25 | 27 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 35 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 49.3 | 39.2 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 42.6 | 42.2 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42.9 | 41.1 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37.3 | 38.16 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | |
| | English Language Learners | 13.40 | 24.88 | |
| 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 | 35 | 37 | 39 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22 | 23 | 33 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 39 | 44 | 44 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33.2 | 45.71 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33.2 | 45.71 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37.95 | 32.02 | |
| | English Language Learners | 47.05 | 45.71 | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 37.3 | 35 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27.2 | 31.7 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32.4 | 41.1 | |
| | English Language Learners | 27.2 | 24.7 | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 29 | 33.6 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 30.8 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26 | 33.6 | |
| | English Language Learners | 23.55 | 52.6 | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 49.2 | 56.9 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46.8 | 56.9 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 64.8 | 56.9 | |
| | English Language Learners | 19 | 41.9 | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 26.5 | 17.4 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24.9 | 14.9 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26.1 | 12.6 | |
| | English Language Learners | 56 | 20 | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | 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 | 35 | 35 | 18 | 32 | 33 | 22 | 30 | | 74 | 29 |
| ELL | 11 | 38 | 44 | 18 | 33 | 42 | 25 | 47 | | 80 | 36 |
| ASN | 64 | 62 | | 64 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 37 | 33 | 20 | 25 | 28 | 36 | 55 | | 86 | 34 |
| HSP | 34 | 43 | 43 | 27 | 35 | 38 | 40 | 63 | | 80 | 42 |

| 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 | 53 | 45 | 27 | 35 | 23 | | 50 | 57 | | 95 | 67 |
| WHT | 48 | 43 | 31 | 38 | 35 | 34 | 55 | 72 | | 79 | 63 |
| FRL | 33 | 37 | 34 | 25 | 29 | 30 | 37 | 57 | | 79 | 39 |
| 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 | 15 | 32 | 29 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 54 | 56 | | 79 | 10 |
| ELL | 14 | 36 | 38 | 15 | 33 | 27 | 55 | 40 | | 74 | 38 |
| ASN | 67 | 60 | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 48 | 38 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 50 | 61 | | 90 | 26 |
| HSP | 39 | 46 | 38 | 27 | 31 | 25 | 58 | 66 | | 86 | 41 |
| MUL | 64 | 46 | | 32 | 35 | | 80 | 91 | | 68 | 40 |
| WHT | 54 | 57 | 34 | 40 | 36 | 25 | 76 | 87 | | 80 | 43 |
| FRL | 36 | 45 | 37 | 26 | 29 | 25 | 56 | 67 | | 84 | 30 |
| 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 | 19 | 43 | 39 | 15 | 27 | 27 | 32 | 28 | | 75 | 20 |
| ELL | 14 | 37 | 38 | 20 | 40 | 48 | 31 | 34 | | 80 | 30 |
| ASN | 31 | 53 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 44 | 40 | 24 | 32 | 27 | 61 | 49 | | 86 | 26 |
| HSP | 39 | 49 | 47 | 33 | 40 | 33 | 54 | 62 | | 85 | 42 |
| MUL | 69 | 60 | | 39 | 55 | | 83 | 82 | | 90 | 32 |
| WHT | 54 | 53 | 52 | 42 | 43 | 25 | 79 | 77 | | 84 | 49 |
| FRL | 36 | 47 | 44 | 28 | 36 | 29 | 59 | 59 | | 83 | 28 |

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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 48 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 488 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 45 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 50 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

We have noticed that lack of comprehension is a trend. Our students are not understanding what the questions are asking of them and then lack the ability to differentiate between multiple choice answers in History. In some areas our ELL students have outperformed everyone else, but in some areas they are the lowest performers. ELL students are showing the more growth in comparison to our ESE students.

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

Math continues to be our greatest content that needs improvement while our ESE students are the subgroup that shows the greatest need for improvement.

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

Test taking skills through bellwork in US History, data review to target students in all content courses, to identify accommodation, check in with bubble kids, ESE specialist to check in with co teach classes for support in coteach facilitation, intentional small groups for acceleration, strong PLC leaders with years of experience and period off to pull data, plan, progress monitor, APC partnering with money math PLCs, mini assessments to accelerate student progress, math small group instruction

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

Science and History showed the greatest improvement.

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

Teachers utilized round robin test review, teachers build manipulatives that focused on data analysis based on lower performing standards, focused on 3 standards a week, science teachers incorporated reading passages and strategies into their EOC review.

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

Analyzing trends in student assessment data and other opportunities to spiral and reteach. Teachers will provide quality instruction daily. Quality instruction is designed using the four principles of excellent instruction
mini assessments, small instruction, strong and structured biweekly PLCs

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.

Observations and feedback throughout year will determine PD, as well as Four Principles of Instruction, BEST training for math teacher is available on Canvas for self paced training with preparation for new textbooks, teachers attended acceleration vs remediation training, implementing SBG techniques to focus on standards, use WIG scoreboard for targeting students, student incentives such as snacks

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

PLC leader support sessions weekly, full time academic coach, resource periods for coaching, WIG sessions and classroom scoreboards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | Our school has decided to focus on standards-aligned instruction as our area of focus based on Administration/ ILT observation data as well as our students' performance on state assessments. |
| Description and Rationale: | <p>In July of 2022, our goal is to earn 550 points. Below are the outcomes that each content area is hoping to meet.</p> <p>ELA- 50/50/45</p> <p>Algebra – 25% proficiency, up 10% BQ</p> <p>Geometry – 40% proficiency, up 10% BQ</p> <p>US History –80% proficiency, up 18%</p> <p>Acceleration – 400 certs, 120 seniors (60%), 100 Juniors (50%), 100 Sophmores (45%), All Freshman</p> <p>Biology – 65% proficiency, up 22%</p> <p>Through Wildly Important Goal (WIG) sessions, admin/ILT walkthroughs, PLCs, ILT meetings, and student scoreboards we will be monitoring for our desired outcome.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | |
| Monitoring: | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers will provide quality instruction daily. Quality instruction is designed using the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction and will be measured using walkthrough data to then determine teacher PD as well as the student scoreboards. Get Better Faster will be used as a book study to help instructional leaders provide feedback and coaching to all teachers to improve their practices. We will also continue to stay focused on WIG/Scoreboard implementation through PLCs. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Everything that we are doing is to improve teacher practice. Using Get Better Faster will be used as a tool to help improve instruction. The Four Principles of Excellence will help teachers focus on best practices. The WIG sessions and student scoreboards will help hold both teachers and students accountable for their learning and growth. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Summer training for DH's on Instructional Leadership

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

2. Every 4 weeks provide a sub and have teachers review student work/mini assessments and plan with reading coach can be done as individual or as a PLC based on need

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

3. Purchase and utilize standards based grading book by Marzano to ensure what is in the grade book aligns to what students know

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

4. Attend a webinar for Marzano's standards based grading

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

5. Bring teachers on campus during summer for PD on PLC's and build out the curriculum map for their mini assessments

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

6. Utilize USAtestprep software to help teachers track student progress and also utilize as a bank of assessments for teachers that correlate to state assessments

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

7. Utilize Wizer.me software

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

8. Track data for students-sub groups ESE,ELL

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

9. Bring in PLC leaders to work on curriculum mapping and assessments, learn how to run an effective PLC

Person Responsible Dina Langston (dina.langston@hcps.net)

Postsecondary Readiness-

Through a partnership with English 4 and Economics, our seniors are exposed to Career Cluster/interest inventories, career pathways, resume and cover letter activities, interview protocols, college application assistance and financial aid information. Additionally, our seniors and juniors have opportunities to attend post secondary representatives visits to our campus, field trips to colleges and for careers. When selecting classes for programming, students can choose electives based on interests or even take dual enrollment courses on our campus or at HCC to save on cost of college. Our College and Career Coordinator holds FAFSA info sessions for parents, College Wednesday Workshops for students each week to assist with the admissions process, and visits Senior Classes to talk to students about options. Lastly, our school has partnered with AMIKids to provide pre-apprenticeship opportunities to seniors who plan on entering the work force.

Person Responsible Stacey James (stacey.james@hcps.net)

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.

In comparing the discipline data of Armwood HS to the discipline data across the state we identified two primary areas of concern. Armwood ranks "Very High" in Violent Incidents, finishing 422 out of 505 high schools in the state of Florida; in Hillsborough county, Armwood ranks 17 out of 33 schools. This data suggests the school is struggling with teaching students how to handle conflict in a constructive, non-violent manner. This is a primary area of concern given the significance of the safety and well-being of our children.

Another area of concern for Armwood HS are the Property Incidents, which also ranks "Very High". Armwood ranks 450 out of 505 schools in the state; further, it ranks 26 out of 33 schools in Hillsborough County. The data suggests that the school struggles in providing supervision beyond the coverage of students, likely due to lack of personnel. This would constitute a secondary area of concern, as it does not directly affect the health and safety of students.

Armwood HS has established several initiatives to address the concerns, primarily using Tier 1 interventions centered on building school culture. One important initiative is the House System, which splits the school- students, teachers, administration, and support personnel- into four teams, or Houses. This initiative should create opportunities for students to become familiar with one another and learn social, cultural, and emotional differences amongst their peers. This type of socio-emotional learning will undoubtedly help students build social connections that mitigate conflict.

Another important initiative is the use of the Crime Watch established by our school resource officer, Deputy Baker. She has spearheaded an initiative that allows students to serve as an extra set of eyes, warning administration when there are students breaking school rules or posing a hazard to others. One of the Crime Watch's objectives is mitigating property loss by patrolling areas such as the locker room, parking lot, and gym- areas that are prime for property theft.

These two initiatives will provide a positive impact on the behavior and discipline data. We will use the data derived from referrals and teacher feedback to guide these two programs in order to improve the culture and climate of Armwood High School.

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.

We send out a weekly newsletter via Sway to all parents with an email on file. Our newsletter highlights student life, athletics, important dates and information. We use our school twitter to send this same information via social media. We also make sure that our website stays up to date so that students, parents and community stakeholders can get the information they need. We hold parent informational nights about completing the FAFSA/ getting financial aid. We also hold parents nights for our at-risk students. Our service clubs are out in the community performing service every weekend. We have also reached out to local businesses and organizations such as the Seffner Chamber of Commerce to partner with our school. We have created a Community Engagement Committee made up of teachers and administrators to discuss and implement ways to get parents, the community and local businesses more involved in our school but also to identify ways for our students and programs to get more involved with feeder schools and local businesses. This year we are implementing the Armwood Hawk House System as our PBIS system. Through the house system model, we will reward students for attendance, behavior and course grades. Additionally, we will use the house system as a way to promote school culture by having house vs house competitions outside of the school day. We want to make Armwood a place to have fun so we will also be purchasing board games and snacks as incentives in the lunchroom. Our SGA students will be overseeing lunchroom games and incentives. The rationale is through consistent expectations students will have a clear understanding of appropriate behaviors. In addition, the system rewards those students and teachers following the positive expectations. This system has shown to increase student attendance and decrease behaviors that impact learning.

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

This year we are partnering with the local Beef o Brady's to provide discounts to teachers on Fridays to encourage them to attend football games as a faculty. The manager at Beefs is also providing his event venue space to all clubs and athletics free of charge with discounts on food for end of year and end of season celebrations. We are also partnering with the school board to name our Press Box after one of our teachers who passed away. The community rallied together with thousands of former students and community members signing a petition. During our Homecoming Football game, hundreds of current and former students, faculty and staff and school board members will be present to dedicate the press box to Mr. Burnham. This year we will also be partnering with former students who have gone on to have successful athletic careers by holding Hall of Fame dedication ceremonies. These events will provide opportunities for the community members and former Hawk families to become reinvigorated within our school. We continue to partner with the Florida Guard who provides meals to teachers throughout the year. We are currently working on building more relationships with the community through the Great American Teach In and Guest Speaker Opportunities to expose our students to careers, colleges and concerns in the community.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |