**Hillsborough County Public Schools** 

# **Ami Kids Tampa**



2022-23 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	11
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	12

# **Ami Kids Tampa**

1730 MARITIME BLVD, Tampa, FL 33605

www.amikids.org

## **Demographics**

# **Principal: Cornelius Bobo**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	DJJ
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
	2021-22: No Rating
	2020-21: No Rating
School Improvement Rating History	2018-19: No Rating
	2017-18: No Rating
	2016-17: No Rating
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.

As an educational entity we will provide each student with the necessary tools to become productive and responsible citizens.

.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will become academically, socially, and behaviorally proficient as we prepare them to transition back to traditional educational settings

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

#### 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** 

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

\_

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/31/2022, Cornelius Bobo

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

#### **Demographic Data**

# **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2022-23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAT
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
	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
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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 8/31/2022

## 2021-22 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAT
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	5	4	6	1	29
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
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	5	0	2	3	3	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3	2	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	3	4	6	1	24

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

# 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		2022			2021		2019				
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement		52%	51%					56%	56%		
ELA Learning Gains								54%	51%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								41%	42%		
Math Achievement		39%	38%					49%	51%		
Math Learning Gains								48%	48%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								45%	45%		
Science Achievement		46%	40%					69%	68%		
Social Studies Achievement		49%	48%					75%	73%		

## **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
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Con	nparison					
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
80	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				

			MATH	ł		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison					
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				

			SCIENC	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison					
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School District		School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2022						
2019						

School
State Minus State
School State Minus State
<b>'</b>
School State Minus State
•
School State Minus State

# Subgroup Data Review

		2022	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
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
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

# **ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	4
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	8
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	,
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A		
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0		
White Students			
Federal Index - White Students			
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A		
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0		
Economically Disadvantaged Students			
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students			
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students  Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A		

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### **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 related to the Areas of Focus?

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

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?

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

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

Last Modified: 4/28/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 11 of 12

\_

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

-

#### Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

#### **Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

\_

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

\_

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

\_

#### **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.

**Action Step** 

**Person Responsible for Monitoring** 

\_