

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Plant City 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	20
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Plant City High School

1 RAIDER PL, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Traci Durrance

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2015

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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Plant City High School

1 RAIDER PL, Plant City, FL 33563

[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	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

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 are committed to working together to provide opportunities for our students to grow academically and socially to prepare them for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride, Accountability, Respect

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
Sullivan, Susan	Principal	Facilitate and implement the Instructional Leadership Team, ensure data analysis and support all school personnel in school goals and action steps.
Smith, Lana	Assistant Principal	Develop a system for monitoring and managing SIP goals. Facilitate the collection and analysis of data.
Young, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring and differentiated instruction.
D'Acunto, Vincent	Instructional Coach	Develop teachers through Professional Development, Learning Walks and implementation of strategies.
Schutz, Michael	Math Coach	Monitor math data and implement tutorial programs to increase student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2015, Traci Durrance

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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,376

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

21

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

23

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	644	642	546	475	2307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	226	169	137	725
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	133	67	41	375
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	138	185	136	100	559
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	138	9	21	318
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	115	85	51	347

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	66	79	68	37	250

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	31	0	0	1	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	9	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 1/25/2022

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	666	628	530	568	2392
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254	200	205	201	860
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3	17
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	209	186	131	109	635
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	123	19	24	317

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	28	73	53	31	185

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	22	0	0	2	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4

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	666	628	530	568	2392
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254	200	205	201	860
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3	17
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	209	186	131	109	635
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	123	19	24	317

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	28	73	53	31	185

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	22	0	0	2	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4

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				47%	56%	56%	44%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	54%	51%	53%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	41%	42%	40%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				56%	49%	51%	61%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				64%	48%	48%	69%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	45%	45%	64%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				59%	69%	68%	62%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	75%	73%	65%	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	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%	

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	72%	73%	-1%	70%	2%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	48%	63%	-15%	61%	-13%	

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	62%	57%	5%	57%	5%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress Monitoring for ELA was assessed through Achieve 3000 in Fall, Winter and Spring. Biology, Algebra, Geometry and US History were assessed in Fall and Winter with baselines and midyear assessments and in the Spring with EOCs.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16.25%	20.55%	23.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.56%	14.47%	19.75%
	Students With Disabilities	19.8%	26.2%	27%
	English Language Learners	.1%	.1%	.7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49.3%	67.4%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49.3%	67.7%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	68.2%	68.01%	44%
	English Language Learners	35.7%	97.95%	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	48.1%	46.8%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.9%	43.95%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	61.4%	60.54%	53%
	English Language Learners	27.2%	31.72%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	28.3%	31.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.2%	22.2%	24.1%
	Students With Disabilities	30.6%	32.7%	33%
	English Language Learners	2/3%	2/3%	1/2%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33.2%	59.6%	24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.2%	59.6%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	33.2%	52.7%	19%
	English Language Learners	33.2%	60.32%	15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	22.4%	24.79%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.4%	24.79%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	22.4%	23.1%	19%
	English Language Learners	13.4%	23.1%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	57.5%	N/A	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57.5%	N/A	75%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	75%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	7%	8.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3.9%	4.9%	6.5%
	Students With Disabilities	5.5%	6%	6%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26.5%	65.5%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	68.91%	34%
	Students With Disabilities	20.9%	60.32%	32%
	English Language Learners	29.5%	55.56%	100%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.75%	37.83%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.4%	37.83%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	35.25%	39.26%	N/A
	English Language Learners	9.4%	31.72%	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44.4%	56.93%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.3%	52.97%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	39.3%	55.22%	41%
	English Language Learners	19%	22.94%	20%

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10.6%	10.5%	11.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.1%	7.5%	7.4%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	14%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29%	44.98%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.2%	44.98%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	20.7%	33.6%	16%
	English Language Learners	20.7%	44.98%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	25.1%	44.4%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.1%	44.4%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	9.25%	N/A	100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	57.5%	72%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.95%	61.97%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	19.95%	72%	33%
	English Language Learners	4.1%	10.49%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	20	32	24	21	34	38	33	42		95	26
ELL	13	34	32	22	32	37	19	34		98	41
BLK	24	42	33	26	32	36	32	36		92	22
HSP	35	44	39	35	36	42	42	62		99	52
MUL	48	52		39	29		47			90	

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
WHT	53	57	37	45	39	45	57	77		99	58
FRL	35	45	38	35	36	42	43	61		97	44
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	24	32	39	43	35	45		89	23
ELL	17	41	39	40	65	83	32	49		86	37
ASN	73	93								100	73
BLK	23	39	33	35	36		22	54		92	30
HSP	40	51	41	51	68	71	55	69		92	51
MUL	55	50		77	73		73			100	50
WHT	60	59	41	66	64	64	71	80		94	48
FRL	41	51	41	52	62	65	53	67		92	45
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	18	40	31	37	57		41	33		79	17
ELL	17	40	35	45	58	56	42	34		78	23
ASN	90	60									
BLK	25	38	31	40	58	42	49	53		88	20
HSP	38	55	41	59	67	69	57	56		88	38
MUL	38	38		64			55			93	38
WHT	56	56	45	73	76	65	71	80		95	52
FRL	35	49	39	56	66	61	57	57		89	32

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	51
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	556
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
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	49
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	51
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	57
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	48
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?

Overall test scores in all content areas, grade levels and subgroups declined. Due to the pandemic, loss of instructional time due to quarantines, challenges that were presented daily contributes to these trends.

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

Algebra and Geometry demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Algebra scores have declined by 29 and Geometry by 18.

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

Contributing factors include poor attendance, quarantines, loss of instructional time. Strategic placement into remedial courses to provide intervention will help improve future scores. There will also be test prep boot camps to enhance and grow skills needed for proficiency.

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

Although the overall number did not increase we saw less of a gap in ELA scores from previous assessments.

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

Students are appropriately placement into reading courses that are designed to grow literacy skills needed for proficiency on testing, cross content area subjects and overall success in reading comprehension and application.

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

The use of small group instruction based on student need and areas of focus will accelerate student learning. Small group instruction is designed to differentiate based on the need of each student to address areas of concern and to grow skills needed to meet and exceed proficiency.

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 and leaders will have the opportunity to participate in professional development on Visible Learning, Demonstration Classrooms, Learning Walks, Lunch and Learns as well as Professional Learning Communities where data analysis and next steps for instruction are the focus.

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

Ongoing assessment of student needs, teacher needs and school needs will be monitored in order to focus in on growth opportunities and adjustments to sustain improvement and meet the academic and social goals of the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: In order to build a culture and environment that is positive and uplifting for students and faculty we will focus on building relationships through incentives, positive behavior supports and a community of trust.

Measurable Outcome: Based on an improvement in the culture and environment, attendance rates should increase to 85% or higher and overall assessment data should improve as students will be in class and learning in a positive learning environment.

Monitoring: Monthly checks on attendance rates, quarterly progress monitoring data on assessments, PLC notes on student trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will use PBIS-Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports as well as Self-Efficacy strategies to increase student -teacher relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS will be used to encourage positive behaviors and discourage inappropriate behaviors. PBIS addresses behavior dysfunction in schools, benefiting all students. It has also proven to decrease suspensions and improve grades and in some cases lessen bullying incidents. All of these contribute to a safer school environment which fosters a positive school culture. Self-Efficacy strategies can be used in all classrooms to help students experience success and advocate for themselves. Teachers that create this opportunity and environment for their students will positively impact student-teacher relationships. These Evidence-based Strategies will strengthen the school culture and environment which will directly impact student attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

Quarterly Attendance and Grade Incentives

Person Responsible Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

Raiders of Excellence Rewards and Turn Around Student Awards

Person Responsible Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Class Incentives for no tardies.

Person Responsible Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Increasing student engagement directly impacts overall learning, test scores and proficiency across all content areas. Focusing on improving student engagement will directly impact student success and overall school improvements in data and growth.

Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: The overall goal will be to earn a enough combined school grade points to earn an A.

Monitoring: Through Professional Learning Communities our teachers and staff will monitor assessment data, trends in the classroom and address areas of focus to continually improve student engagement daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our teachers will use CLOSE Reading strategies, Jigsaw method, and classroom discussion to increase engagement and understanding of literacy concepts. Students will also have opportunities to practice in print and on laptops/computers to increase cross content literacy skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: CLOSE Reading allows students to read the same text for different purposes. This strategy increases understanding and ability to improve skills needed when reading more rigorous texts. CLOSE Reading also prepares students to lead and participate in class discussions which in turn increases academic ownership and learning. Another evidence-based strategy we will use is the Jigsaw Method, this helps members of a group or class share responsibility for learning. It also increases the use of critical thinking skills, listening, speaking and communication.

Action Steps to Implement

Preplanning Professional Development on Opportunity Myth and Academic Ownership. The perspectives presented in this PD will help shift the perception of the teachers and staff which will allow more opportunities for students to be postsecondary ready.

Person Responsible Jessica Young (jessica.young@hcps.net)

Visible Learning Training to explain effect sizes of practices and what strategies build academic ownership. As teachers begin to implement these strategies in their classrooms students will receive tools and skills necessary for post secondary readiness.

Person Responsible Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

Demonstration classrooms, learning walks and coaching cycles with the TTD.

Person Responsible Vincent D'Acunto (vincent.d'acunto@hcps.net)

Professional Development for staff to increase the effectiveness of Professional Learning Communities and the strengthening of academic ownership through the use of new strategies. PD will include specific strategies that will increase engagement with our SWD and African American students in the ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible Jessica Young (jessica.young@hcps.net)

Weekly walk throughs with feedback given to the teacher.

Person Responsible Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Students are exposed through English classes to a career academy and lessons that prepare them for post secondary readiness. This enables students to prepare for the workforce, college, and/or career and technical programs. They are prepared for interviews, creating resumes, attending a career fair as well as the opportunity to tour local businesses and industries.

Person Responsible Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@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 comparison to the State data our school is in the high category, however we have seen a decline from previous years data in relation to in-school and out-of-school suspensions. During this school year we will monitor student behavior through the use of an RTI specialist, a Climate and Culture Resource Teacher, and a Student Success Coach. These resources will provide interventions and steps to improving behavior, climate and culture overall.

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.

Our school works to include all Stakeholders, we work diligently with our community members, parents, students and staff to build an environment that is open to communication and willing to make improvements for all involved parties. We have a number of events that promote academics, sports, extra curricular as well as opportunities for life beyond high school into the college and career level.

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

We have a Business Advisory Board that is made up of community members, business affiliates, and school staff that contributes to our Career Academy and whole school. These relationships are intended to work towards ensuring our students are prepared for life beyond high school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00