

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Wharton 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Wharton High School

20150 BRUCE B DOWNS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Rowan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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	24

Wharton High School

20150 BRUCE B DOWNS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide students with a meaningful education that develops creative, productive and responsible students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will reach their maximum potential, graduate high school, and be prepared for lifelong success.

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
Rowan, Michael	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities at Wharton High School. Also, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Lefebvre, Crystal	Other	Parent and Community Engagement, Tier 1 Interventions, Schoolwide Culture and Climate, Instructional Leadership Team
Torres, Maria	SAC Member	Student and Parent Engagement Liaison
Brown, Roslyn	Other	Student academic support, teacher support with strategies and academic interventions

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/2/2018, Michael Rowan

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.*

0

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

113

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,190

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

9

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

6

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	602	573	504	514	2193
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	76	80	72	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	39	37	21	177
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	157	132	117	99	505
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	100	56	51	331
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	32	61	39	77	209

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

Friday 8/20/2021

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	560	504	515	482	2061
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	152	181	142	647
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	27	14	10	73
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	157	132	117	99	505
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	100	56	51	331

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	5	41

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	560	504	515	482	2061
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	152	181	142	647
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	27	14	10	73
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	157	132	117	99	505
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	100	56	51	331

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	5	41

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				52%	56%	56%	53%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	54%	51%	50%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	41%	42%	32%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				42%	49%	51%	47%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				42%	48%	48%	43%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	45%	45%	34%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				59%	69%	68%	56%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	75%	73%	72%	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	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	57%	66%	-9%	67%	-10%
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	74%	73%	1%	70%	4%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	30%	63%	-33%	61%	-31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	57%	-14%	57%	-14%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

FSA and EOC Assessments Report, progress-monitoring data dashboard, and achieve3000 data for ELA.

-For fall, proficiency is considered 30% or higher on the baseline test for Biology, Mathematics, and US History.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	30	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	16	21
	Students With Disabilities	23	40	46
	English Language Learners	0	11	10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	64	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	60	41
	Students With Disabilities	80	70	50
	English Language Learners	70	40	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	76	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	66	67
	Students With Disabilities	87	91	50
	English Language Learners	28	59	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	na	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	na	0
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	0
	English Language Learners	na	na	0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	37	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	19	23
	Students With Disabilities	47	53	65
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	60	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	45	13
	Students With Disabilities	47	53	50
	English Language Learners	40	58	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	53	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	28	29
	Students With Disabilities	48	44	33
	English Language Learners	21	21	33
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	na	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	na	0
	Students With Disabilities	na	55	0
	English Language Learners	na	na	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	10	9
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	18	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	48	10
	Students With Disabilities	43	39	0
	English Language Learners	14	45	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90	94	0
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	18	88	10
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	0
	English Language Learners	na	68	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	63	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	58	66
US History	Students With Disabilities	na	77	0
	English Language Learners	na	63	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	63	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	58	66
	Students With Disabilities	na	77	0
	English Language Learners	na	63	50

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2	5	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	46	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	53	21
	Students With Disabilities	49	na	0
	English Language Learners	38	94	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	5	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	na	0
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	0
	English Language Learners	69	82	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	na	62	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	na	50
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	0
	English Language Learners	na	85	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	30	31	20	35	38	25	31		84	24
ELL	12	33	38	18	23	35	30	44		83	29
ASN	68	70		48	37		82	83		100	66
BLK	30	34	29	22	24	29	38	50		90	27
HSP	31	40	36	26	27	29	41	65		89	39

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	41	46		40	36		67	93		96	52
WHT	67	57	44	55	33	32	75	83		97	56
FRL	26	36	34	24	25	31	42	57		88	27
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	20	33	26	25	46	38	31	47		83	
ELL	19	42	38	22	44	48	28	44		71	18
ASN	66	64	55	50	39		63	85		90	62
BLK	35	38	18	28	43	48	41	64		85	19
HSP	43	44	35	38	44	48	47	73		84	28
MUL	67	61		48	37		71	90		88	39
WHT	72	57	37	59	43	39	85	90		91	51
FRL	36	40	27	30	40	44	44	61		81	18
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	27	38	23	21	26	26	23	44		81	7
ELL	23	36	22	28	37	32	25	55		73	28
ASN	71	60		62	57		71	92		94	61
BLK	38	50	42	32	35	25	39	58		87	17
HSP	46	43	22	40	39	32	48	61		82	34
MUL	58	48		63	31		69	90		97	36
WHT	70	54	26	66	53	48	75	85		92	54
FRL	36	42	29	34	35	30	38	60		82	24

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92%
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	35
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	69
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	37
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	41
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	59
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	58
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Learning gains for bottom quartile in math achievement, social studies achievements, reading achievement, and science achievement all increased with the students with disabilities subgroup. Learning gains for bottom quartile in math achievement, reading achievement, and science achievement all increased with the students with ELL subgroup.

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

The data component showing the greatest need for improvement is the ELA learning gains for the bottom quartile. The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile is 29%, compared to 41% in the district, which is a decrease of 3% from the year prior. Ninth grade students were placed into classes with students of all achievement levels, where teachers were encouraged to differentiate instruction to meet all learners' needs. However, this lessened opportunities for explicit reading instruction.

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

Teachers are working in PLCs to collaborate and design lessons around standards based instructions and utilizing assessments to drive student learning for all groups of students.

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

Learning gains for bottom quartile in math achievement, social studies achievements, reading achievement, and science achievement all increased with the students with disabilities subgroup. Learning gains for bottom quartile in math achievement, reading achievement, and science achievement all increased with the students with ELL subgroup.

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

Science and Math worked on lunch tutoring for students enrolled in FSA/ EOC classes focusing on standards that were on the FSA. We held an FSA/EOC parent information night to increase parent involvement

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

We will continue to offer homework help, math and science tutoring, 7 mindsets, and provide opportunities for student and parent voice by holding SAC meetings during school hours.

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.

1. Professional Development training will be provided bi-weekly to enhance instructional learning strategies. PLC's will meet bi-weekly to plan for standard based instructions, and review data to drive learning. Bi-weekly meeting attendance, and PLC logs/reports will be reported to leadership team.
2. Model classrooms will allow teachers inability to observe instructional and active learning strategies and apply them within their classrooms.
3. Teachers will have opportunities to participate in ghost walks, observing peers' classrooms when not instructing, to further develop their own practice and enhance student learning.

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

ILT, PLC's, TTD, CCEIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Daily assessments will be used throughout lessons/units to monitor and modify instruction in real-time, as well as to provide immediate feedback through formative assessments and in-class assessments. Daily assessments were decided as a focus due to teacher evaluation data and classroom walkthrough data.
Measurable Outcome:	ILT, and department heads, will perform walk throughs and collect data on assessments used during daily lessons with a goal of at least three assessment per class period. In the 2020-2021 school year, FSA ELA percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 4%, from 52% in 2019 to 56%. Algebra 1 FSA EOC percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 4%, from 30% in 2019 to 34%. Geometry FSA EOC percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 4%, from 43 in 2019 to 47%. FSA ELA learning gains from the lowest quartile will increase by 6%, from 48% in 2019 to 54%. Math FSA EOC learning gains from the lowest quartile will increase by 4%, from 44% in 2019 to 48%.
Monitoring:	ILT, and department heads, will perform walkthroughs and collect data on assessments used during daily lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will be provided to teachers through Teach Me Tuesdays with the focus on daily assessments during lessons. Specific strategies will be chosen based on data collected from coaching cycles, and classroom walkthroughs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing daily assessments, teachers will be able to improve student learning by using daily assessments to drive instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Within PLCs teachers will plan assessments to be used throughout a lesson to gauge the understanding of students and adjust their lesson accordingly. Support will be provided to teachers by Teach Me Tuesdays, site-based PD, demonstration classrooms, instructional coaches, department heads, and teacher talent developers.

Person Responsible Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Teachers will intentionally design lessons around standards-based instructions by backward design, unpacking the standard, and understanding the level of standard.

Measurable Outcome:

In PLC's teachers will submit a biweekly PLC logs with the focus on standard based instruction. Also, ILT and department heads will collect data during walkthroughs on standard based instruction.

Monitoring:

Instructional leadership, including administration, will utilize PLC logs to collect data to monitor that teacher's are planning standard based lessons. ILT and department heads, will utilize walkthrough forms to collect data to monitor that teacher's are implementing standard based lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will unpack the standard and utilize backwards design lesson planning to develop and implement lessons that have outcomes align with the standards. Teachers will be provided multiple opportunities to enhance instructional pedagogy with active learning strategies through biweekly professional development. Teachers will also receive collaborative supports through model classrooms which will allow teachers to observe strategies directly and implement within their own classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Designing lessons around standards was selected based on teachers feedback and data collected during pre-planning. Strategies are teacher-centered, teacher-selected, and driven by teacher choice. This allows for "best practices" to be shared collectively among the instructional staff to enhance all student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Effective ILT, Effective PLCs, grow school climate, culture, and perception, professional Development participations like Teach ME Tuesdays, Demonstration classrooms, and book study. Guidance support team visible in cafeteria, halls, and classrooms, wildcat connection. to accomplish this focus. These will be monitored by instructional leadership, administrators, department coaches, and department heads.

Person Responsible

Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will be strengthening our Professional Learning Communities effectiveness by focusing on best practices as we establish and adhere to group norms, we focused on student centered discussions, examining student work and collaborating with each other to problem solve.
Measurable Outcome:	Schoolwide PLCs will meet to establish norms, roles and expectations. PLCs are meeting biweekly with a focus on examining student work, collaborating with each other to problem solve, standards based instruction, and daily and common assessments.
Monitoring:	Instructional leadership and admin will be monitoring the PLCs. Each PLC establishes a lead whom will focus on creating an agenda, and determining if the PLC will be data focused or planning focused.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In the PLCs, teachers will establish and adhere to norms, focus on student centered discussions, examine student work, participate in collaborative problem solving, design lessons around standards based on instructions, and plan for implementation of daily assessment strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During pre-planning, teacher's feedback was collected that identified PLCs to be a schoolwide focus. Utilizing these tools, teacher will be able to support not only the entire school, but also focusing on the bottom quartile through all content areas so that we would see improvement in all FSAs and EOCs.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs will establish PLC Norms and PLC leads. The PLC Leads are responsible for reminding the PLC of future PLC topics and materials, resources, and data to bring to the PLC. PLC leads also are responsible for posting the PLC logs on the WHS PLC Canvas page. PLC roles alternate each PLC. The instructional leadership team will create PLC logs for Data PLCs and Planning PLCs. To improve the effectiveness of the PLC, a schoolwide PD will be done on effective PLCs. The PLC PD will be created and presented by the instructional leadership team. Additional ongoing differentiated support will be provided to PLCs by the administrative team and the school teacher talent developer.

Person Responsible Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

Within PLCs, teachers will look at their students' data, specifically their SWD and ELL subgroups. PLCs will develop plans for accommodations, modifications, differentiation including enrichment, and remediation to ensure the needs of each student are met. Teachers will continue to monitor their students' progress by collecting data to review at PLCs and revising their plans and instruction.

Person Responsible Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

The school will prepare students to be college and career-ready by having specific PLCs that focus on increasing the number of students that receive industry certifications. PLCs will group will be created for AP and dual enrollment teachers to allow them to collaborate and improve student learning.

Person Responsible Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@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.

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlge.org site, Wharton High School reported 5.7 incidents per 100 students in the 2019-2020 school year. This rate is greater than the Statewide high school rate of 3.3 incidents per 100 students.

Wharton High School will implement the 7mindsents schoolwide in all homeroom classes, to focus on SEL and improve school climate and culture and therefore improving behavior and discipline data. SEL will be monitored by surveying students at key points throughout the school year. The 7 mindsets team will look at the SEL data and adjust their plan accordingly.

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.

Ongoing communication and collaboration is foundational to create and enhance positive relationships with students, parents, families, and stakeholders. This communication includes access to the school's website, Parent Link, Canvas, as well as social media platforms. The school also encourages parent involvement through the SAC, voluntarism, PTSA, Booster Club, and parent-teacher conference nights. Conference nights are scheduled throughout the school year, so that parents and families can have face-to-face or virtual interaction with teachers to discuss progress and see work samples of their child's mastery. In addition, students and faculty will have access to wellness curriculum and supports through district supported programs: 7-Mindsets and Humana Go365.

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

Michael Rowan - Principal: Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities at Wharton High School. Also, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.

PTSA supports the positive culture and environment of the school by recognizing the teacher and support staff of the month, as well as providing incentives for students and schoolwide initiatives. Students promote

a positive culture and environment by having over 40 student-led clubs and participating in sports and arts that perform at district, regional and state-level competitions. Clubs promote integrity, equity, and inclusivity. Teachers promote a positive culture and environment by providing SEL through 7mindsets in their homeroom classes. Community partners promote a positive culture and school environment by providing appreciation gifts to teachers and incentives to students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00