Robinson High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2016

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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.](http://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

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

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.

We will provide a positive, healthy, and safe environment while promoting high expectations and providing diverse cultural experiences and valuable educational opportunities for the Robinson High School family.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Robinson High School multicultural family is committed to preparing students to meet the challenges of the future by encouraging lifelong learning, international and intercultural awareness, work and professional skills, and "Pride Through 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
Bhoolai, Robert	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative and counseling activities of Robinson High School. Demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
	Assistant Principal	Assists with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of Robinson High School.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/13/2016, David Brown

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
89

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,446

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

16

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

11

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	366	422	329	349	1466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	98	90	25	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	31	23	4	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	70	40	0	170
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	56	34	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	97	50	36	318

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	87	32	32	2	153

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

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	366	422	329	349	1466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	37	43	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	33	26	37	128
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	29	32	53	128

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	366	422	329	349	1466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	93	99	43	324
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	31	23	4	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	63	37	16	166
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	63	37	17	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	29	32	53	128

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				69%	56%	56%	66%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	54%	51%	59%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	41%	42%	39%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				46%	49%	51%	49%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				34%	48%	48%	49%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	45%	45%	51%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				72%	69%	68%	73%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				82%	75%	73%	81%	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	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	66%	53%	13%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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	70%	66%	4%	67%	3%
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	80%	73%	7%	70%	10%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	63%	-36%	61%	-34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	57%	-4%	57%	-4%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 9 - ELL and SWD subgroup in Fall - ESOL Support, WIDA Testing, Baseline Assessment; Winter Mid-Year Assessments; Spring FSA; Mathematics ELL and SWD subgroup - Fall Baseline Assessment, Formatives by subject; Winter Mid-year Assessments; Spring EOC Algebra/Geometry, Final exams; Biology ELL and SWD subgroup - Fall Baseline Formatives (Departmental); Mid-year Assessments; Spring EOC; US History - N/A Grade 10 - SWD subgroup - Fall Baseline, NewsELA; Winter Mid-year Assessment, NewsELA; Spring FSA; Mathematics Fall Baseline Assessment; Formatives by topic; Winter Midyear Assessments; Spring Geometry EOC or Final Exams. Biology and US History - N/A; Grade 11 ELA - ELL and SWD subgroup - Fall Baseline, Winter Midyear Assessment; Spring EOC; Mathematics - ELL and SWD subgroup - Fall Formative Assessment; Winter Semester Exam; Spring Final Exam; Biology N/A; US History - Fall Baseline, Winter Mid-year Assessment, Spring EOC; Grade 12 - ELL and SWD subgroup - Fall Baseline, Formative; Winter Midterm Exam, Spring Final Exam; Mathematics ELL and SWD subgroup - Baseline/Formative, Winter Midterm Exam, Spring Final Exam. Questions, tasks, interactions, responses, and assessments will yield data allowing the teacher to assess students' progress toward learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards, and teacher will provides for lesson adjustments.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53%	57%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	45%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	63%	65%	65%
	English Language Learners	26%	33%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	45%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54%	34%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	73%	30%	50%
	English Language Learners	8%	18%	0%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	9%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	12%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	79%	42%	23%
	English Language Learners	16%	9%	0%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58%	63%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	55%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	69%	72%	72%
	English Language Learners	27%	25%	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55%	45%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	45%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	41%	39%	27%
	English Language Learners	23%	45%	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/18%	12/21%	4/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/23%	7/15%	2/25%
	Students With Disabilities	2/16%	2/10%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	2/55%	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	3/74%	3/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	1/97%	2/100%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	1/97%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	13	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	13	12
	Students With Disabilities	20	29	34
	English Language Learners	20	13	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24%	30%	7/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	31%	3/13%
	Students With Disabilities	23%	26%	3/19%
	English Language Learners	24%	37%	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	3/32%	3/21%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/53%	1/21%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	2/53%	1/21%	NA
	English Language Learners	1/32%	1/15%	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	75	54	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	43	70
	Students With Disabilities	87	54	69
	English Language Learners	30	42	50

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	20	14
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	28	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/36%	5/39%	17/6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/36%	5/39%	13/8%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	5/20%
	English Language Learners	NA	1/39%	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/1.5%	1/18%	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/1.5%	1/18%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/31%	1/29%	12/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	1/29%	7/14%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	4/0%
	English Language Learners	NA	1/29%	NA

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	18	29	24	24	26	25	20	59		79	29
ELL	17	30	24	15	19	10	29			84	24
ASN	83	57		63	46		83	96		100	92
BLK	35	34	35	18	26	32	37	69		81	45
HSP	60	50	19	37	20	25	63	67		86	53

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	68	57		24	21		67	87		92	64
WHT	71	51	32	60	29	36	73	89		89	68
FRL	48	42	26	26	22	24	53	67		78	51

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	23	30	27	25	34	40	45	50		79	22
ELL	25	38	29	22	25	20	29	36		90	37
ASN	88	86		57			93	97		90	70
BLK	40	46	41	28	18	19	46	70		95	26
HSP	58	54	25	35	35	38	59	71		90	53
MUL	71	68	36	56	44		87	93		100	50
WHT	77	71	45	56	41	44	80	86		90	68
FRL	45	50	28	29	35	38	50	71		85	44

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	25	39	30	28	45		27	44		69	36
ELL	17	29	24	20	41		27	22		88	57
ASN	85	75		82	59		83	87		96	77
BLK	41	45	38	25	28	50	45	68		76	25
HSP	57	53	43	39	43	36	65	76		88	56
MUL	65	62	33	52	59		85	69		92	70
WHT	73	61	35	58	53	54	82	90		89	73
FRL	48	50	39	35	37	43	56	70		82	47

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	78
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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	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	60
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	44
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?

FSA/EOC data indicate 65% of students are proficient in ELA, 43% in Math, 67% in Science, 84% in US History.

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

Data showed regression in level 3, 4, and 5 students' testing performance.

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

Student achievement and gains significantly decreased over the past 2 years during the pandemic. Placing focus on comprehensive polanning and rigorour instruction will allow us to accelerate and address unfinished student learning.

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

US History students indicated a two percent increase in assessment scores.

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

We believe our school's emphasis on multi-cultural awareness and understanding among teachers and students contributed to this improvement.

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

Walkthroughs with feedback forms directly related to look-for criteria, Action Plan review through ILT, Weekly Walkthroughs, PLC logs

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.

Professional development opportunities will include FSA/EOC Data Review and planning, student baseline data chats and action planning, scaffolding to the Standards. Teacher reflection statements to ILT will used for teacher goal-setting.

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

O365 OneNote Walk-through form to identify site wide trends, Paper-based feedback forms will provide immediate feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement significantly decreased over the past 2 years during the pandemic. Regression in level 3,4,and 5 students' testing performance has guided us to our Area of Focus. We are using concepts of Collective Teacher Efficacy to develop our area of focus and Instructional Priorities. Our school's three Instructional Priorities are to focus on teacher planning and execution of lessons by planning appropriate grade level content aligned to the standards (Rigorous Content , referenced in Boyd's "Spotlight on Effective Teaching: An Interview with John Hattie" in Research Information for Teachers 2009); developing clearly stated objectives, expectations, and procedures (Academic Ownership); and demonstrating tangible evidence of learning (Demonstration of Learning). Post-Secondary readiness will continue to be monitored through SAT,ACT, and Acceleration opportunities offered through RHS CTE courses, Dual Enrollment, ROTC and IB program completion.
Measurable Outcome:	Students' FSA/EOC data for 20-21 reflects Levels 3+ as 65% for ELA, 43% for Math, 67% for Science, 84% in US History. We plan to average student achievement as measured by school-wide FSA/EOC ELA, Math, and Science data by 2% during 2021-22. Student Acceleration (Post-Secondary Readiness) will increase to a minimum of 70% for the class of 2022.
Monitoring:	Our monitoring strategy places focus on comprehensive planning, rigorous instruction, and demonstration of learning. Administration and ILT members will conduct classroom walk-throughs based on look-fors relating to these topics. Walkthrough feedback collected over time will provide cumulative data for analysis and feedback. Professional Learning Communities will recognize strengths and address teacher professional development as appropriate, based on student performance data. Acceleration "boot camps" will be established through CTE teachers, led by the department chair. Students will participate in their CTE course, prior to sitting for the acceleration tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Bhoolai (robert.bhoolai@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective Teacher Efficacy, an evidence-based strategy which John Hattie has researched and written about extensively, is the rationale behind our area of focus. Hattie's research found that Collective Teacher Efficacy has the highest ranked effect size on student learning. Our school's three Instructional Priorities focus on Rigorous Content. Academic Ownership, and Demonstration of Learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	S. Waach's distillation of John Hattie's findings (2018) visible-learning.org. and FSA/EOC data provide the rationale for our instructional priorities. FSA/EOC data for 20-21 reflects Levels 3+ as 65% for ELA, 43% for Math, 67% for Science. Through analysis of meta-studies, Hattie found that Collective Teacher Efficacy has the strongest effect size on student learning.
Action Steps to Implement	

Standards-based lesson planning through PLCs, ongoing professional development on BLP, academic counseling with staff and volunteers in the CUBE, ELP targeted to English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities, in all core subjects. ESE staff with use the Co-Teach model of support facilitation. This will allow for small group pull-outs, push-in to core curriculum courses, and IEP monitoring to take place for our students with disabilities. ELL students will receive support from the ESOL Resource Teacher and ELL Paraprofessional. ELL students will be scheduled in core curriculum ELA/Reading support courses as appropriate.

Person Responsible   Robert Bhoolai (robert.bhoolai@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Robinson High School reported 1.33 drug/public order incidents per 100 students: County rank #13 of 33, State rank #197 of 505. Robinson reported 0 property incidents: County rank #1 of 33, State rank #1 of 505. Robinson reported 2.2 violent incidents per 100 students: County rank #19 of 33; State rank #433 of 505. One of Robinson's goals is to have more visible adult supervision in hallways during class, lunches, and passing times. Students and staff are encouraged to Say Something to administrators, school counselors, a teacher, the school psychologist, or a school social worker if they observe behavior indicating current problems or possible future problems.

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.

Robinson High School's Mission is to provide a positive, healthy, and safe environment wile promoting high expectations and providing diverse cultural experiences and valuable educational opportunities for the RHS family. Ongoing collaborative planning and professional development for teachers in Creating Culturally Conscious Classrooms will strengthen a positive school culture and environment.

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

Administration, social services, success coach, school counselors, social worker, school psychologist will continue to work with students, teachers, parents/guardians, and voiunteers to continue building cultural consciousness in classrooms and throughout the campus.. Staff members will continue be offered professional development in cultural consciousness and teen mental health.