Hillsborough High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hillsborough High School

5000 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Gordon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

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	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 (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Hillsborough High School

5000 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[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	64%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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 seek to create a welcoming, supportive environment, which promotes academic rigor, critical thinking and intellectual understanding in order to inspire and nurture all students to be productive, caring members of a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student, without exception, future ready.

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
RaiaLong, Jessica	Teacher, Career/ Technical	SAC Chair - oversees SIP development and voting processes. Plans SAC meeting agendas.
King, Kelly	Principal	Provides SAC with progress monitoring data, assists with SIP development.
Fitzgerald, Trisha	Assistant Principal	curriculum
Cooks, Suzanne	Reading Coach	Reading Coach and supporting PLCs
Giraud, Essie	Attendance/Social Work	Social Worker and MTSS Coordinator for attendance
wright, johana	Teacher, ESE	Department Head and CHOICE Academy administrator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/15/2020, Kevin Gordon

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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

86

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,011

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

6

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

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518	523	492	454	1987
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	208	165	182	720
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	38	21	16	112
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	116	150	140	128	534
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	127	107	0	364
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	22	29	13	9	73

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

Thursday 7/15/2021

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	519	485	452	415	1871
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	217	191	182	816
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	46	42	38	199
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	186	210	104	722
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	186	210	104	722
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	144	131	117	550
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	107	102	26	370

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	10	2	36

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	16	0	0	0	16
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	519	485	452	415	1871
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	217	191	182	816
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	46	42	38	199
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	186	210	104	722
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	186	210	104	722
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	144	131	117	550
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	107	102	26	370

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	10	2	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	16
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				49%	56%	56%	48%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	54%	51%	47%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	41%	42%	31%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				41%	49%	51%	35%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				43%	48%	48%	50%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	45%	45%	55%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				63%	69%	68%	83%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	75%	73%	59%	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	47%	55%	-8%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	59%	66%	-7%	67%	-8%
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	66%	73%	-7%	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	47%	57%	-10%	57%	-10%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

9th and 10th grade students will be progressed monitored through the NEWSELA/SCHOOLCITY platform in English classes.
11th and 12th grade students will be progressed monitored through the NEWSELSA platform in Reading classes.
Math mid year, baseline and EOC scores.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	34	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	26	29
	Students With Disabilities	25	45	48
	English Language Learners	2	3	5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	46	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	46	25
	Students With Disabilities	27	57	25
	English Language Learners	27	58	26
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	52	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	52	48
	Students With Disabilities	72	58	55
	English Language Learners	50	64	45
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				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	42	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	29	33
	Students With Disabilities	16	58	60
	English Language Learners	5	8	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68	48	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	40	25
	Students With Disabilities	86	39	25
	English Language Learners	37	39	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	37	35	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	31	40
	Students With Disabilities	27	18	22
	English Language Learners	27	33	28
	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 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	12	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	8	8
	Students With Disabilities	19	18	16
	English Language Learners	3	3	3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	28	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	28	26
	Students With Disabilities	35	20	20
	English Language Learners	29	64	27
Biology	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
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	51	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	36	48
	Students With Disabilities	34	66	40
	English Language Learners	28	20	30

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	9	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	5	5
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	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
Biology	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
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

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	16	30	29	8	22	28	31	18		78	42
ELL	20	43	42	16	27	33	29	24		96	58
ASN	90	75		78	70		100	82		100	97
BLK	27	37	30	14	19	27	39	31		91	46
HSP	39	47	41	25	29	31	53	43		92	65

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	67	52		33	40		63	77			
WHT	77	62	57	69	56		87	93		89	87
FRL	34	43	37	20	25	28	48	39		90	57

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	8	39	36	13	26	22	23	45		81	26
ELL	19	44	42	30	51	48	30	31		74	56
ASN	93	81		100			97	87		96	96
BLK	28	42	38	31	39	37	48	57		85	39
HSP	38	50	41	34	41	47	52	65		84	63
MUL	65	71		41			62	64		100	67
WHT	81	68	60	72	56		90	88		94	87
FRL	34	48	40	32	41	46	49	59		83	54

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	23	19	12	32	29	75	30		71	10
ELL	15	34	32	20	40	50	85	33		66	60
ASN	93	64		92	78		98	96		97	97
BLK	25	41	33	23	39	49	67	45		76	32
HSP	41	42	29	30	47	51	78	55		79	63
MUL	85	56		58			90	82		88	60
WHT	77	63	33	68	73	75	91	84		93	68
FRL	34	42	31	27	43	49	75	50		77	49

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	50
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	40
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	87
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	36
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	46
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	55
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	75
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	43
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?

ESE subgroups showed highest improvement over time. FRL and ELL students show less improvement over the year.

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

Current:Math scores fell the most as evidenced by FSA scores. Math scores improved over the prior year according to school city

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 results from 2019-2020 data. New actions would include looking at student work in PLCs and trends discovered through the learning walks.

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

Our ELA FSA scores remained constant.

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

Achieve 3000 was used to support ELA and reading instruction. ELA PLCs have strong leadership.

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

Grouping students and utilizing the strategies contained in the standard aligned academic framework provided. Using common assessments in math classes to improve outcomes.

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.

Quarterly professional development in backward design lesson planning, the 4 principals of excellent instruction, learning walks, instructional technology and questioning and discussion strategies.

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

Training for PLC leaders and the instructional leadership team.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We experienced a drop in math proficiency, learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	We will improve math proficiency to 40 points, math learning gains to 42 points, and learning gains for the lowest 25% to 40 points.
Monitoring:	Baseline and mid year assessment data will be monitored.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yolanda Driskell (yolanda.driskell@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based instructional planning and common assessments in PLCs with the culmination of backward planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By aligning lesson plans to standards our students will be exposed to grade level appropriate instruction. The use of common assessments will allow teachers to progress monitor mastery of content and make adjustments to instruction as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs meet monthly. Coordinated by ILT (King, Fitzgerald, Florez, Thomas-King)
Common assessment data is reviewed. (Fitzgerald, Florez, Cooks, Burgess, Driskell, Jackson)
Plans for reteaching are developed. (PLC Leaders)
Khan Academy is utilized to prepare students for post secondary readiness (Florez, Cooks)
PLCs in CTE develop strategies for Industry Certification Assessments for post secondary readiness (Maxey)
PLCs in IB develop mock assessments for post secondary readiness (Fitzgerald)

Person Responsible	Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on observation data and state assessment data, PLCs will focus on standards based lesson planning and common assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency and learning gains by 5 points each.
Monitoring:	PLCs complete data collection and feedback form following each PLC meeting. These are sent to the APC for review and follow up with the instructional leadership team. The instructional leadership team plans quarterly professional development.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Over the past 4 years the PLC has actively moved from standards-based instruction, collaborative student learning lessons, and finally, backward lesson planning (keeping the end in mind).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase student and teacher engagement in the final, end result of their education.

Action Steps to Implement

Review ELA data - Cooks
Share data w/PLCs - Cooks
PLCs address reading strategy - PLC Leaders
Reading strategy implemented - PLC leaders

Person Responsible	Suzanne Cooks (suzanne.cooks@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Underperforms in ELA and mathematics. These students are also represented in economically disadvantaged subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve proficiency by 2% and gains by 5%.
Monitoring:	baseline, mid year and teacher developed common assessments will be used to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based lesson planning will be implemented through PLCs and supported by the reading coach and math coach. Teachers meet monthly to plan for common assessments based on lesson plan implementation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is to ensure students are challenged with grade level appropriate work, teachers must plan with the standards as the foundation. Developing common assessments aligned to the standards will allow teachers to progress monitor.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers unpack standards - Alex Florez and Suzanne Cooks
2. Teachers meet in PLCs to develop common assessments - Trisha Fitzgerald, Alex Florez, Suzanne Cooks
3. Teachers implement lesson plans - Teachers
4. Instructional Leadership Team conducts walkthrough observations - Kelly King, Trisha Fitzgerald
5. Teachers administer common assessments - Florez and Cooks
6. Teachers review assessment data in PLCs - Florez and Cooks

Person Responsible Trisha Fitzgerald (trisha.fitzgerald@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will improve school culture through time management skills, positive reinforcement strategies and cultural awareness of our students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We "CARE" initiative identifies school wide expectations for behavior in all school settings (classroom, common areas, assemblies, lunch, etc.) Positive behavior incentives are provided to students who model these behaviors.
The school climate and culture resource teacher provides mediation and restorative practices to address interpersonal conflicts between students.

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

Elizabeth Eby - oversees We "CARE" - a positive behavior support program
Andrea Thurston - oversees Girls Summit
ShawnRee Miller - coordinates with District Supervisor for Men of Vision

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00