
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

King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gregory Basham

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
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 (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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

King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>63%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>86%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
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.

King High School will support all students' growth as critical thinkers, global citizens and informed decision makers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become a community which demonstrates the principles of P.R.I.D.E. (Positivity, Respect, Integrity, Determination and Excellence)

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
Castelli, Arlene	Principal	Principal of school. Oversees all aspects of facility and curriculum.
Stone-Geide, Bianca	Behavior Specialist	Works with at risk students
Grieb, Lori Sue	Reading Coach	Works closely with Reading department for developing reading strategies. Works with all school departments to increase literacy skills
Moody, Richard	Behavior Specialist	Works with at risk students and monitors MTSS (Multi Tiered Systems of Support) for all students
Cary-Greco, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies teacher and CTA Representative
Diehl, Cara	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal that works with our traditional and IB students
Walters, Quicta	Math Coach	Math teacher, Math department head and math coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Gregory Basham

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

106

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,604

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

35

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

21

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	0	340	395	349	406	1490
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	134	122	139	513
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	54	25	19	156
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	122	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	119	0	0	246
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	82	47	38	214

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/12/2021

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	415	401	435	408	1659
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205	179	183	148	715
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	2	16
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	140	122	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	119	0	0	246
	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	12	65	47	46	170

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	415	401	435	408	1659
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205	179	183	148	715
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	2	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	122	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	119	0	0	246
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	65	47	46	170

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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				48%	56%	56%	49%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	54%	51%	50%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	41%	42%	25%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				28%	49%	51%	34%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				33%	48%	48%	50%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	45%	45%	53%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				55%	69%	68%	50%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	75%	73%	71%	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	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	52%	66%	-14%	67%	-15%	

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	73%	73%	0%	70%	3%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	12%	63%	-51%	61%	-49%	

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.

Achieve 3000, Baseline and midyear Data

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	33	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	18	25
	Students With Disabilities	55	46	51
	English Language Learners	75	63	62
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	33	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	17	18
	Students With Disabilities	55	47	51
	English Language Learners	8	13	13
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	48	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	37	0
	Students With Disabilities	54	55	0
	English Language Learners		35	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	40	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	23	25
	Students With Disabilities	75	63	64
	English Language Learners	10	6	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	40	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	21	22
	Students With Disabilities	75	63	64
	English Language Learners	10	6	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	38	32	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	32	0
	Students With Disabilities	29	26	0
	English Language Learners	35	35	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	25	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3	7	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	6	6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	7	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	33	29	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	29	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	37	0
	English Language Learners	0	28	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	46	50	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	41	0
	Students With Disabilities	52	57	0
	English Language Learners	30	34	0

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		6	4	3
	Economically Disadvantaged		7	4	4
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		6	4	3
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		0	31	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	31	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	30	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		43	39	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		42	34	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	29	0
	English Language Learners		0	34	0

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	26	42	38	18	32	34	20	33		83	11
ELL	16	32	26	14	23	22	39	33		79	39
ASN	89	71		76	43		91	100		99	96
BLK	26	34	33	14	18	29	28	38		82	15
HSP	43	44	32	26	19	24	57	53		86	52

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	61	55		21	30		64	73		84	75
WHT	48	46	25	35	18		57	78		83	70
FRL	28	35	31	16	19	27	35	44		81	29
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	14	35	33	16	24	31	26	49		77	6
ELL	16	47	42	17	41	50	28	46		60	27
ASN	92	86		78	60		96	92		98	92
BLK	23	40	35	14	27	37	26	54		79	17
HSP	38	50	45	21	31	70	55	71		75	52
MUL	63	63		40	23		72	94		100	56
WHT	62	57	35	47	47		71	97		92	71
FRL	28	44	37	19	31	45	35	62		79	26
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	16	32	25	8	26	26	17	40		67	6
ELL	11	24	27	20	40	46	25	38		73	30
ASN	95	80		92	89		96	100		100	91
BLK	21	31	21	18	37	40	22	52		84	22
HSP	39	40	37	36	43	50	41	71		83	43
MUL	68	65		50	50		79	94		70	57
WHT	71	64	25	53	65		78	84		92	71
FRL	28	37	25	21	37	44	33	58		82	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	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	84%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	33
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	83
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	32
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	42
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	58
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	52
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	35
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?

In ELA, students struggled with the analysis of complex texts and the ability to synthesize information across passages.

In US History and Biology, that reading deficit impacted the student's ability to demonstrate understanding when faced with higher-order questions.

US History trends focus in on cause and effect, specifically surrounding the identification of significant historical shifts and who influenced them. They also lacked proficiency in grappling with various stimuli presented in the assessment.

Algebra 1 deficits included a lack of proficiency in algebraic equations. During Baseline assessments, students also struggled with determining what the problems (especially the experiential ones) asked students to discover.

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

ELA - Looking for connections across texts

US History - Deconstructing stimuli

Biology - Understanding cells, cell function, and macrobiology

Algebra 1 - Understanding

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

In all core contents, we are implementing targeted skill review throughout the school day. We are also training teachers in collaborative planning, to ensure all students are receiving quality and timely instruction. Literacy coaching and the improvement of literacy instruction is woven throughout all contents. Moving forward, we are implementing Learning Labs as a new professional learning practice.

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

Historically, we have seen improvements in the US History EOC. Covid's impact on our assessment data has been negative in all areas.

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

US History was afforded the opportunity to share common planning or lunch periods, allowing them a built in time to plan. Those teams met to develop common assessments, analyze student data and work products, and share pedagogical expertise.

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

We will have two foci this year: implement collaborative planning to align instruction in core courses and plan for student ownership of learning via academic discourse.

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.

Teachers are able to work on implementing these initiatives in many ways. First, the Professional Development Teacher Leader team has three pathways to practice team planning. Teachers can also participate in our newly launched Learning Labs in order to find discourse strategies to implement. Specific strategies are also being spotlighted in both department meeting and PLC's.

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

ILT training this year is centered on building capacity of our school leaders and the processes and protocols necessary to conduct PLC's, Professional Learning, and initiative planning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our math scores have been traditionally low over the past several years. We are working with the math department to increase students confidence and abilities in their math skills. Our school will show improvement in Learning Gains.

Measurable Outcome: Our 2021 Learning gains for our three critical areas are: (SWD = 32%, ELL= 23% and Blk = 18%) will increase by at least 5 percentage points for each category. These students will be specifically invited to ELP

Monitoring: Our math department is working with district coaches on a weekly basis. They are participating in professional development specific to math strategies and implementing them in their classrooms. They are conducting common monthly progress monitoring, reviewing data and identifying trends in their PLCs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy we are working on is Collaborative Planning. We want all of our teachers, to plan together weekly to help increase their lesson planning. Once they have a lesson planned, they can adjust as the students need help or changes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We conducted a Inquiry Cycle allowing all of our teachers to develop what they thought was most important in planning for the year. More teacher buy in promotes successful planning.

Action Steps to Implement

Bi weekly PLC Meetings with agenda and notes submitted after each meeting

Person Responsible Cara Diehl (cara.diehl@hcps.net)

Address our post secondary readiness

Person Responsible Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Test scores across all content areas can be improved. Academic Coaches have been hired to work with our teachers to increase teaching strategies across all content areas.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers will have teaching strategies to use for all students to show an increase in their performance in classes and on assessments.

Monitoring: Academic Coaches will keep weekly logs of who they are working with and how they follow up with their coaching using their coaching cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Coaching cycles will be used and informal observations will be made by academic coaches. The strategies will be shared with administration so we can also reinforce strategies on informal walk throughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students need to be exposed to top notch teaching strategies and according to our Instructional Priorities which were created via a school wide Inquiry Cycle during pre-planning, we want all students to show individual improvements - not just improvements as a class. Teachers must have multiple tools in their tool kit in order to help all students achieve.

Action Steps to Implement

Coaching logs will be monitored by administration

Person Responsible Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@hcps.net)

Post secondary readiness will be addressed by encouraging our students to gain Industry Certifications in their elective classes. We also started to work with the East Tampa Career Academy workforce to help our graduating seniors as they transition into adulthood. This may help many of our students secure positions as soon as they graduate. Currently our students can earn an Industry Certification in: Culinary (National Registry or Serve Safe), Customer Service (CSR) and Digital Informational Technology, Social Media Strategist, Entrepreneurship and Small Business.

We have 135 seniors enrolled in our International Baccalaureate program. We have a 100% graduation rate for every student enrolled and a 98% diploma rate for those students to earn college credits with their IB diploma. The majority of our students attend college.

Person Responsible Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@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.

King is currently ranked #354 out of 505 in the state when compared to all high schools regarding school safety. We are ranked 19 out of 33 in Hillsborough County.

We are working on the consistency of administrators and school support. This year we have 2 of our 4 administrators new to King High. We have also hired a Culture and Climate Resource teacher, RTI/MTSS Coordinator as well as an Assistant Teacher to work specifically with our students. Our team meets weekly and discusses ways to improve our practice to help better serve our students.

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 are incorporating PRIDE (positivity, responsibility, integrity, determination, and excellence) into all systems at the school. We are recognizing students who display PRIDE and teachers are using the elements of PRIDE during instruction.

The school is focusing on a token economy system to reward students for pro-social behavior.

Description of System:

Students will receive 1 Pride point for the following actions:

Being in attendance in class, on time = 1 pride point, per period

Walking or acting with PRIDE in common areas = 1 pride point

Miscellaneous school-wide activities (7Mindsets, Spirit Week, Trivia, etc) = 1-5 pride points

EOC/FSA/Course Achievement = 100 pride point

School-run "Lion's Lounge" will provide snacks, school supplies, or event tickets for exchange with student pride points. Teacher Talent Developer (Turner) and Student Incentive Team (Teacher Leaders) are monitoring which teachers are distributing pride points and which students are redeeming them.

We also utilize three full-release adults (teachers and assistant teachers) to work with students in the hallways. These adults provide the support for administration by interacting with students in a positive manner and encouraging positivity in students.

We have also implemented a positive motivation process for teachers, based on the book "How Full is Your

Bucket" which allows teachers to have a physical space with accolades, thanks, and positive interactions between teachers, staff, students, and administration.

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

- Students - Use the Pride Points system
- Teachers - Use the Pride Points system, the Bucket system
- Student Incentive Team - Monitor and adjust student incentives
- Teacher Incentive Team - Monitor and adjust teacher incentives
- Student Affairs Administrative Team - Implement restorative practices in lieu of classroom removal and suspension

All of our systems revisit the procedures at the end of the quarter and adjust based on our goals and behavior data.

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: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00