

Hillsborough County Public Schools

South County Career Center



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

South County Career Center

2810 JOHN SHERMAN WAY, Ruskin, FL 33570

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2017

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Commendable 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Commendable 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

SCCC will provide a comprehensive, collaborative environment to nurture and ensure the academic and personal success of our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South County Career Center provides and opportunity for our students to achieve academic success and to move forward towards their career. It is the goal of our faculty and staff to assist our students so that they may be successful in their coursework, earn a high school diploma, and either further their education or seek gainful employment. Support is provided to help our students achieve the skills and attitudes essential for success in their careers as well as their lives.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

SCCC students are considered at risk for not graduating on time. We have multiple programs to help support from overage 8th grade program (ATA), to teen parent, as well as EBD Center for students with disabilities.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Woods, Jennifer	Principal	As it relates to SIP, job duties and responsibilities for the principal are to ensure compliance of the timeline, to develop with the instructional team the yearly goals, objectives, and strategies.
Caplinger, Juanita	Teacher, ESE	SAC Chair, Completed SIP waivers with faculty.
Lerch, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	Provide assistance from previous years data to compare.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/16/2017, Jennifer Davis

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

22

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

23

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

167

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

1

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

1

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	1	0	2	3	21	10	11	29	90	167	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	7	17	56	98	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	1	2	8	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5	44	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	3	33	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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

Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	1	0	2	1	3	18	10	17	58	96	206	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	10	6	11	22	45	97	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	10	3	8	29	28	84	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	14	26	26	3	83	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	14	26	26	3	83	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	6	35	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	6	35	

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	1	0	1	0	2	1	15	8	30	42	9	109

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	7	7	
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					57%	61%		59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					56%	59%		56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	54%		49%	52%
Math Achievement					55%	62%		57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%		53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	52%		47%	52%
Science Achievement					50%	56%		51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		79%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	11%	66%	-55%	67%	-56%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	19%	73%	-54%	70%	-51%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

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	9				20					54	8
ELL				8						66	5
BLK				7						70	
HSP	7	27		2	18		5	15		48	3
WHT				8						52	25
FRL	8	33		5	13		3	18		55	5
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		25						27		31	
ELL										35	
BLK										53	
HSP										40	
WHT								31		40	10
FRL		16			23			14		45	
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

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	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	142
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	75%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
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	16
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	28
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	18
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Point sheets to track daily progress- useful identifying early when there is struggle. Referral to PSLT which creates next steps for each student.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELL- Utilizing Spanish component on Edgenuity as well as a schoolwide vocabulary focus.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Hispanic students- 93% did not make adequate progress.

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

We struggle in each area identified. Trends are that our students struggle in ELA specifically.

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

Tracking system, review of edgenuity to see quality of learning.

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.

PD for tracking systems, also PD weekly on peer counseling that can be used to support individual students each day.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on Achieve data, current 10th and 11th graders, 100% (9/9) need aggressive intervention in the areas of making inferences and drawing conclusions.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

When reviewing SAT/ACT/ FSA data for ELA, we expect to see an increase in the category of making inferences in each individual student.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

PD given to teachers weekly on making inferences and drawing conclusions through peer counseling class.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Woods
(jenniferl.woods@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Peer professional development for successful teachers to show strategies to others.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Weekly activities schoolwide to assist teacher sin teaching this specific strategy.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Incorporated games into preplanning using Think Alouds to breakdown inferences and drawing conclusion.
2. Weekly puzzles into peer counseling with gradual release model from whole group to small group to partners to individual.
3. Provide a weekly Teach Me opportunity for staff members on Fridays during lunch to highlight.
4. Provide a scavenger hunt opportunity at the end of the 9 weeks.

Person Responsible

Juanita Caplinger
(juanita.caplinger@hcps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

It is looked at individually and broken down by ESSA groups.

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on our one elementary student, he has met level 3 academically but is in a Behavior Supports center based on behavior. We are implementing PBIS strategies to specifically address his target behaviors and have goals set in place to address positive behavior replacements.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Task completion, tantrums, and off task behavior; specifically, task completion related to test taking is our area of focus. When all strategies are implemented with fidelity, he will be able to sustain a testing environment for at least 30 minutes at a time 9 out of 10 opportunities.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Daily point sheets, daily and weekly incentive plans, and quarter goals to be addressed in his IEP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carole Fernandez (carole.fernandez@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Based on previous monitoring on FBA, PBIB, he struggles most during test taking times. We have incorporated breaks, small chunking, and multiple testing days, verbal encouragement, and incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The student has responded well to the above strategies during test taking opportunities that have presented themselves this school year.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

elementary

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have one elementary student who began last year as a high level 1 and tested at a level 3 on FSA last year and we want to ensure we maintain level 3 status or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Ensure student remains level 3 and increases in points or becomes a level 4.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

I-ready data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carole Fernandez
(carole.fernandez@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Utilizing BrainSpring and I-ready to monitor progress

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

District chosen materials and brain spring is a multisensory approach to ensure engagement, high level work and expectations.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Include elementary student(s) in Monthly ILT meetings to address current progress as it relates to the goal.

Person Responsible

Carole Fernandez
(carole.fernandez@hcps.net)

Monthly ESE Triage meeting will include a review of student and progress to track where student might fall each month.

Person Responsible

Carole Fernandez
(carole.fernandez@hcps.net)

Complete midyear on I-Ready and complete a data breakdown to determine next steps for semester 2.

Person Responsible

Carole Fernandez
(carole.fernandez@hcps.net)

Complete 2-3 "pre-tests" windows with students to prepare students for the length of testing.

Person Responsible

Carole Fernandez
(carole.fernandez@hcps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Monthly ILT, Monthly ESE Triage, Mid year assessment data and pre-test data for semester two.

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.

SCCC is a PBS school that models and encourages DEN behaviors (Determined, Engaged, Nobel Actions). We utilize daily point sheets that allow for students to receive weekly and monthly incentives base don points earned. We have a schoolwide 6th period class, Peer Counseling, that focuses on 7 mindsets and SEL curriculum. We have incorporated a Student Council this year to provide leadership opportunities for students.

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

Students- Student Council, Peer Counseling, Weekly and Monthly Recognitions
 Teachers- Teacher Leaders academically and through committee roles, PLCs, Committees, Daily classroom positive interactions with students and schoolwide focus on the same expectations.