

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Steinbrenner High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Ewell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	20%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%)
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	22

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

Steinbrenner High School will be among the top-performing high schools in Florida

Provide the school's vision statement.

Steinbrenner High School will provide a rigorous course of study for students served in all programs

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
Ewell, Tiffany	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the running of the school and directs all instruction and support for all stakeholders.
Savino, Jaclyn	Assistant Principal	Oversees curriculum and instruction, including the master schedule
Clemmons, Holly	Assistant Principal	Attendance, Mentor program
Gerhardt, Ben	Assistant Principal	COVID commander, discipline, duty roster
Garcia-Blanchard, Brandi		Buses, discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Tiffany Ewell

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.*

2

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

98

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,525

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

20

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

7

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	0	0	2527	2527
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	

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

Sunday 8/29/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609	646	597	639	2491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	23	37	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	53	39	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	28	37	46	124
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	35	40	31	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	609	646	597	639	2491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	23	37	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	53	39	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	28	37	46	124
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	35	40	31	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14

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	0	0	0	

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				80%	56%	56%	77%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	54%	51%	61%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	41%	42%	52%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				73%	49%	51%	69%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				59%	48%	48%	52%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	45%	45%	47%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				85%	69%	68%	83%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				94%	75%	73%	88%	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	79%	55%	24%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	78%	53%	25%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

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	84%	66%	18%	67%	17%
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	94%	73%	21%	70%	24%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	63%	-3%	61%	-1%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	57%	20%	57%	20%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Tools used were Achieve3000 for ELA, across all four grade levels. For Biology, Math and US History, we used the county-developed progress monitoring tools in School City.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	59%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	48%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	56%	67%	70%
	English Language Learners	12.5%	11%	11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62%	54%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	14.6%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	73%	67%	n/a
	English Language Learners	20.9%	28%	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65%	76.7%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	56.8%	59.3%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	75.5%	84.5%	n/a
	English Language Learners	27.4%	31.7%	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58%	62%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	62%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	61%	68%	71%
	English Language Learners	45%	51%	54%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49.3%	45.7%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	33.6%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	29.8%	55.8%	n/a
	English Language Learners	56%	11%	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42.9%	46.8%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	39.6%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	37.6%	21.4%	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	65.06%	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 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	17.6%	20.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	19.6%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	0%	7.7%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	33.6%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	19.6%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	4.3%	33.6	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17.8%	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.8	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	64.99%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	50.77	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	81.7%	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	17.9%	n/a

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	23%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	16.8	13%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	n/a	16.8	13.6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18.1%	28.06%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	28.06%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	16.05%	19.8%	n/a
	English Language Learners	16.05%	28.06%	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	35.49%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	21.41%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	46.59%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	85.71%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

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	33	45	35	31	32	33	43	49		92	26
ELL	48	45	55	39	23	30	72	43		96	59
ASN	85	71		80	47		92	91		100	88
BLK	55	32		34	24		72	53		97	59
HSP	70	58	49	54	27	30	85	70		99	71

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	64	50	44	68	33		85			91	80
WHT	74	57	47	66	34	37	85	87		99	75
FRL	64	51	49	46	26	28	72	66		96	55
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	31	43	44	31	41	47	54	68		89	38
ELL	51	42	50	45	41		57			100	40
ASN	92	67		86	64		100	100		100	85
BLK	69	68	56	45	40		67	91		96	28
HSP	76	62	55	69	54	53	85	97		95	57
MUL	90	61		79	79		87	100		100	68
WHT	80	59	51	75	60	52	85	93		96	68
FRL	61	52	46	58	49	48	70	90		89	51
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	42	37	32	36	29	39	58		89	13
ELL	45	38	33	45	36	42	52	50		73	
ASN	86	62		73	58		88	86		100	83
BLK	61	54	68	50	43	46	77	77		93	44
HSP	74	58	48	63	47	42	80	85		95	62
MUL	90	61		75	53		95	96		94	67
WHT	79	63	52	74	55	51	84	90		97	61
FRL	63	56	50	55	46	49	71	77		86	45

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	713
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
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	61
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	64
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	66
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	55
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?

Across the board, there was a marked learning loss. We had a drop in ELA achievement points from 80-73, and a drop in Math points from 73-63. Science held steady at 85, but social studies dropped from 94 to 82.

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

Algebra 1 and learning gains in math overall need the most improvement. The learning gains of the lowest 25% dropped 18 points.

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

The students suffered a learning loss at the end of 2020, which then was followed by major attendance problems due to quarantine. We had over a thousand quarantines last year total, so that was a lot of time that students were not able to receive instruction.

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

Science held strong, with biology remaining first in the district at 84%. While technically this was not an increase in percentage, the fact that there was no learning loss in such an unprecedented year was noteworthy.

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

Personnel changes in biology, including having highly effective teachers working with the students who needed the most help had a definitive effect on the students' achievement.

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

Face to face PLCs, ongoing demonstration classrooms, site-based professional development such as our Teach Me Tuesdays - TMT.

Focused ELP for high needs areas, boot camps for courses with state-mandated testing. TTDs now have release time in their schedules to work with teachers, including modeling lessons and coteaching.

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.

TMT, learning walks, demonstration classrooms, book studies, non-evaluative walkthrough, ongoing data reflection and debriefing.

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

The system we have is inherently sustainable because the backwards design was for it to build capacity in an ongoing way.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Because of the drop in achievement across the board, students need increased rigor in instruction in order to provide them access to grade-level work.
Measurable Outcome:	Scores in ELA FSA will increase 5 points as measured by end of year testing.
Monitoring:	Walkthroughs and baseline and midyear testing, as well as data from Brightfish and Newsela will be used to assess growth, as well as determine the use of rigorous strategies for student empowerment and engagement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Calvin Dillon (calvin.dillon@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be encouraged to practice inquiry learning and independent engagement through differentiated lessons and varied means of assessment and discussion.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students do not learn best when they are simply being given information, so independent productive struggle must happen in each classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher Talent Developers and the admin team will conduct walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and targeted PD to increase the use of rigorous instructional practices.

Person Responsible	Jaclyn Savino (jaclyn.savino@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We need to focus on acceleration and closing the achievement gap, as evidenced by the marked drop in overall performance in Algebra 1 (as well as in other areas, such as ELA). An effort to accelerate instruction schoolwide, but with a particular focus in math classes, is needed.
Measurable Outcome:	We will see an increase in overall math performance from 63 points to 73 by the end of the year, as measured by EOCs.
Monitoring:	Baseline data will be reviewed by PLCs and monitored by the school leadership team, and walkthroughs will verify student engagement with rigorous best practices and differentiated instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marie Puskas (marie.puskas@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use the acceleration plans from the district which outline opportunities for students to close the achievement gap. Teachers will use engaging, rigorous lessons and cooperative strategies to ensure students are getting targeted instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies will be drawn from the district's acceleration plan as well as best practices in instruction for math.

Action Steps to Implement

Site-based training and work through PLCs, with targeted professional development on implementing the acceleration plan.

Person Responsible Marie Puskas (marie.puskas@hcps.net)

Warrior M3 mentoring and reviewing performance of students who fail classes.

Person Responsible Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@hcps.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Technology

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Technology is essential in today's classroom and providing teachers and students with appropriate access to technology will increase engagement and achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	All teachers will be observed using appropriate technology to instruct their students, including presentation and assessment tools, and offering students guided practice with technology.
Monitoring:	Walkthroughs and participation in Teach Me Tuesday PD with a focus on technology.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Technology has been shown to both increase engagement and provide opportunities for students to access instruction in an individualized way.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As we prepare our learners for success in the 21st century, we must empower them with appropriate tools and technological literacy.

Action Steps to Implement

School leadership will engage in walkthroughs and examine observation data to determine appropriate technology use.

Person Responsible Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@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.

Steinbrenner ranked very low for violent incidents among high schools in the state and county, but our property damage incidents were ranked very high. We only had 2.3 incidents out of 100 students overall, with 1.77 incidents per 100 students involving drugs. Our suspension rate was below the state average at 8.5 per 100 students.

Our overall state ranking was 179 out of 505 high schools in the state.

Our primary area of concern would therefore be property damage, followed by drug use.

We will use the new Dashboard on EdConnect to track student performance, maintain and extend our mentoring program, as well as reinstituting the Men of Vision group for students in need of guidance. Our new Dean of Climate and Culture will meet with students as well as guidance and administration having quarterly meetings when kids fail classes.

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 celebrate academic athletic and other successes of the students,

Steinbrenner offers ServSafe certification through the culinary program, personal trainer certification (NASM) through the Athletic Training STEM program, and multiple Microsoft Office certifications through the Career and Technical Education department. Multiple colleges visit the campus throughout the year to discuss the characteristics of potential students. Students are also offered opportunities to visit Career and Technical Centers.

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

We have several stakeholder groups at the school, including parents, students, teachers, staff, other faculty, administration, and community members. We have a supportive community, which includes a very active PTSA and parent members of SAC. We have parent volunteers present on campus often and amass hundreds of volunteer hours. The parents and students are given a voice in directing school-based decisions and implement initiatives related to student safety, wellness, and guidance on more academic endeavors such as standardized test preparation.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Technology	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00