

Polk County Public Schools

Tenoroc High School



2022-23 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Tenoroc High School

4905 SADDLE CREEK RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

schools.polk-fl.net/tenoroc

Demographics

Principal: Ave Wright Gayner

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (42%) 2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | CSI |

* 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 Polk 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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Tenoroc High School

4905 SADDLE CREEK RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

schools.polk-fl.net/tenoroc

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>62%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | C | | D | D |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The Mission of Tenoroc High School is to provide each student with a diverse education that promotes self-discipline, motivation, and excellence in learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tenoroc High School, in collaboration with parents and community partnerships, will strive to challenge and enrich students' lives by providing equitable access to a rigorous, high quality education. This education will assist students in attaining post-secondary success in the areas of education, occupation, and holistic well-being.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hafer, Fatmeh | Assistant Principal | |
| Looney, Jason | Principal | |
| smith, travian | Assistant Principal | |
| Worsley, Michael | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Pienkowski, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Guarasci, Chrystal | Assistant Principal | |
| Morgan, Shaquan | Assistant Principal | |
| Windamaker, Courtnay | Dean | |
| Slifer, Kimberly | Instructional Coach | |
| | | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2012, Ave Wright Gayner

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,159

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

16

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 406 | 315 | 247 | 201 | 1169 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 130 | 100 | 58 | 396 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 89 | 57 | 37 | 291 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 44 | 72 | 17 | 222 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 74 | 48 | 8 | 210 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 157 | 98 | 53 | 513 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 94 | 21 | 56 | 307 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 48 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 174 | 117 | 71 | 520 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| 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 | 74 | 67 | 43 | 18 | 202 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 8 | 40 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/27/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 366 | 290 | 244 | 191 | 1091 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 218 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 44 | 22 | 20 | 144 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 50 | 80 | 20 | 255 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 76 | 54 | 12 | 224 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 133 | 114 | 84 | 425 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 133 | 114 | 84 | 425 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 54 | 30 | 20 | 224 |

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 | 65 | 40 | 32 | 27 | 164 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 86 | 82 | 82 | 352 |

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 | 366 | 290 | 244 | 191 | 1091 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 54 | 52 | 47 | 218 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 44 | 22 | 20 | 144 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 50 | 80 | 20 | 255 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 76 | 54 | 12 | 224 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 133 | 114 | 84 | 425 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 133 | 114 | 84 | 425 |

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 | 120 | 54 | 30 | 20 | 224 |

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 | 65 | 40 | 32 | 27 | 164 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 86 | 82 | 82 | 352 |

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 | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 24% | 41% | 51% | | | | 26% | 47% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 36% | | | | | | 32% | 46% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | | | | | | 27% | 37% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 16% | 35% | 38% | | | | 25% | 43% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 40% | | | | | | 30% | 45% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | | | | | | 31% | 44% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 43% | 26% | 40% | | | | 31% | 58% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 47% | 39% | 48% | | | | 53% | 61% | 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 |

| 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 |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 31% | 54% | -23% | 67% | -36% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 52% | 57% | -5% | 70% | -18% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 22% | 50% | -28% | 61% | -39% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 22% | 53% | -31% | 57% | -35% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 10 | 26 | 25 | 11 | 34 | 38 | 19 | 23 | | 73 | 14 |
| ELL | 13 | 32 | 30 | 19 | 60 | 70 | 39 | 26 | | 84 | 31 |
| BLK | 18 | 38 | 33 | 13 | 33 | | 33 | 33 | | 93 | 37 |
| HSP | 24 | 36 | 29 | 16 | 47 | 52 | 42 | 44 | | 84 | 40 |
| MUL | | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 27 | 36 | 42 | 16 | 39 | 50 | 47 | 53 | | 74 | 51 |
| FRL | 20 | 33 | 33 | 14 | 36 | 42 | 38 | 44 | | 80 | 45 |
| 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 | 12 | 32 | 43 | 7 | 24 | 47 | 16 | 23 | | 74 | 26 |
| ELL | 8 | 44 | 57 | 3 | 15 | | 25 | 27 | | 90 | 49 |
| BLK | 17 | 19 | 29 | 9 | 31 | 60 | 22 | 24 | | 79 | 29 |
| HSP | 22 | 42 | 48 | 10 | 21 | 42 | 37 | 55 | | 88 | 44 |
| MUL | 38 | 36 | | 9 | | | | | | 64 | |
| WHT | 29 | 31 | 33 | 15 | 14 | 29 | 34 | 53 | | 77 | 58 |
| FRL | 22 | 32 | 33 | 11 | 22 | 48 | 31 | 42 | | 77 | 48 |
| 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 | 11 | 27 | 24 | 26 | 33 | | 13 | 37 | | 69 | 8 |
| ELL | 4 | 36 | 37 | 5 | 12 | | 10 | 37 | | 82 | 41 |
| BLK | 16 | 30 | 30 | 8 | 25 | 27 | 18 | 39 | | 81 | 26 |
| HSP | 23 | 32 | 28 | 25 | 27 | 26 | 29 | 46 | | 85 | 42 |
| MUL | 32 | 37 | | 13 | | | | | | 69 | |
| WHT | 32 | 33 | 26 | 33 | 35 | 37 | 40 | 62 | | 71 | 49 |
| FRL | 22 | 31 | 31 | 20 | 30 | 24 | 30 | 50 | | 70 | 39 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 40 |
| 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 | 31 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 445 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 93% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| 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% | 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 | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 40 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | 44 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 37 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Maintained proficiency level in ELA. We had growth in both math and science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the data components, the greatest need for improvement is with ELA.

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

Low performance on state testing, students not consistently receiving standards based instruction. Continued of progress monitoring and the Learning Arc to deepen the understanding of the BEST standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science showed the biggest improvement.

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

Teachers. They did a great job preparing students and effectively used the District quarterly data to help drive instruction.

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

WICOR strategies, writing to learn and using progress monitoring.

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.

PLC to implement the Learning ARC, monthly WICOR professional development and teachers use of teacher led small group instruction.

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

Having a more systematic approach to supporting instruction and monitoring student progress and teacher effectiveness. Doing weekly admin walks and utilizing MTSS effectively.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#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.

We did not reach out previous goal of 30% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase to 30% proficiency rate. Increase learning gains to 45%. Increase learning gains for bottom 25% to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common planning, classroom observations, and feedback. Common Assessments will be done and data reviewed at weekly PLC to review what standards need to be retaught and identify students for remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fatmeh Hafer (fatmeh.hafer@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction not only in English and Intensive Reading, but other content areas. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the FSA ELA. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs. Students will be utilizing the writing to learn method to work through complex thoughts and rationale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In the area of Language Arts, Fatmeh Hafer and our Literacy coaches will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.

Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each ELA grade level to plan.

- 9th grade Tuesday 1st period (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- 10th grade Wednesday 1st period (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- 11th grade Thursday 1st period (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- 12th grade Friday 1st period (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)

Each of the collaborative sessions will focus on the information below.

- Target Task alignment (Literacy Coach)
- Acceleration Instructions/ WICOR Strategies (Literacy Coach)
- Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (Fatmeh Hafer)

- Student work samples (Fatmeh Hafer)
- Admin data chats with teachers (Fatmeh Hafer)

Additional strategies to support targeted growth.

- Administrative meetings to prepare for each week of support (Jason Looney)
- Weekly monitoring and feedback. (Fatmeh Hafer)
- PLCs (Fatmeh Hafer)
- Department Meetings (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- Quarterly professional development days in which we will use building subs and/or substitutes paid for with Title 1 funds (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coach)
- Teacher data chats with students (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- Write Score (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- After school tutoring (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- Quarterly parent nights for each grade level (Fatmeh Hafer and Literacy Coaches)
- Admin Walks and Instructional Reviews (Administration and School Improvement Team)
- Reading Interventionist to provide small-group reading support to students struggling with comprehension (Rebecca Timmons)

Person Responsible

Fatmeh Hafer (fatmeh.hafer@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction in Math. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on both the Geometry EOC and Algebra 1 EOC. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

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

Increase Math proficiency 3-5 percentage points in both Algebra 1 and Geometry.
 10% increase in bottom 25% LG.
 10% increase in LG.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common planning, classroom observations, and feedback. Feedback will be specific to what was planned (target/task) and what was observed. Feedback is one on one with Mr. Looney and the teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Looney (jason.looney@polk-fl.net)

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

Collaborative planning and PLC with data tracking and reflection to drive rigorous instruction (Data chats)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the Geometry and Algebra 1 EOC. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

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.

In the area of Math, Jason Looney and District Math coach will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.

Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each tested subject.

- Algebra 1 Tuesday 4th (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)
- Geometry Wednesday 5th (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)

Each of the collaborative sessions will focus on the information below.

- Target Task alignment (District Math Coach)
- Acceleration Instructions/WICOR Strategies (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)
- Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (Jason Looney)
- Student work samples (Jason Looney)

- Admin data chats with teachers (Jason Looney)
- Additional strategies to support targeted growth.
- Administrative meetings to prepare for each week of support (Jason Looney)
 - Weekly monitoring and feedback. (Jason Looney)
 - PLCs (Jason Looney)
 - Department Meetings (Jason Looney)
 - Quarterly professional development days in which we will use building subs and/or substitutes paid for with Title 1 funds (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)
 - Teacher data chats with students (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)
 - After school tutoring (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)
 - Quarterly parent nights for each grade level (Jason Looney and District Math Coach)
 - Admin Walks and Instructional Reviews (Administration and School Improvement Team)
 - WICOR strategies in each content area (Jason Looney)

Person Responsible

Jason Looney (jason.looney@polk-fl.net)

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

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

Continue to increase Proficiency in Biology to 50%

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to increase the Biology Achievement by a minimum of 20-25%

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common planning, classroom observations, PLC, progress monitoring and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

travian smith (travian.smith@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Collaborative Planning and PLC with Data tracking and reflection to drive instruction (Data Chats). Using writing to learn strategy to organize thinking and increasing comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the BIO EOC. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

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.

In the area of Science, Travian Smith, Kimberly Slifer and District Science coach will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.

Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each tested subject.

- Biology Tuesday 2nd period (Travian Smith, Kimberly Slifer and District Science Coach)

Each of the collaborative sessions will focus on the information below.

- Target Task alignment (Kimberly Slifer)
- Acceleration Instructions/WICOR Strategies (Travian Smith and Kimberly Slifer)
- Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (Travian Smith)
- Student work samples (Travian Smith)
- Admin data chats with teachers (Travian Smith)

Additional strategies to support targeted growth.

- Administrative meetings to prepare for each week of support (Travian Smith)
- Weekly monitoring and feedback. (Travian Smith)
- PLCs (Travian Smith)
- Department Meetings (Travian Smith)
- Quarterly professional development days in which we will use building subs and/or substitutes paid for with Title 1 funds (Travian Smith and Kimberly Slifer)
- Teacher data chats with students (Travian Smith and Kimberly Slifer)
- After school tutoring (Travian Smith and Kimberly Slifer)

- Quarterly parent nights for each grade level (Travian Smith and Kimberly Slifer)
- Admin Walks and Instructional Reviews (Administration and School Improvement Team)
- WICOR strategies in each content area (Jason Looney)

Person Responsible

travian smith (travian.smith@polk-fl.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction in US History. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on US History EOC. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

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

Increasing proficiency on US History EOC to 58%.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common planning, classroom observations, and feedback. Feedback will be specific to what was planned (target/task) and what was observed. Feedback is one on one with Mrs. Guarasci and the teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chrystal Guarasci (chrystal.guarasci@polk-fl.net)

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

Collaborative planning and PLC with data tracking and reflection to drive rigorous instruction (Data chats)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the US History EOC. This will be tracked with formative assessments and the district quarterly assessments.

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.

In the area of Math, Jason Looney and District Math coach will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.

Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each tested subject.

- US History Thursday 6th period- (Chrystal Guarasci)

Each of the collaborative sessions will focus on the information below.

- Target Task alignment (District History Coach)
- Acceleration Instructions/WICOR Strategies (Chrystal Guarasci)
- Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (Chrystal Guarasci)
- Student work samples (Chrystal Guarasci)
- Admin data chats with teachers (Chrystal Guarasci)

Additional strategies to support targeted growth.

- Administrative meetings to prepare for each week of support (Jason Looney)
- Weekly monitoring and feedback. (Chrystal Guarasci)
- PLCs (Chrystal Guarasci)

- Department Meetings (Chrystal Guarasci)
- Teacher data chats with students (Chrystal Guarasci and District History Coach)
- After school tutoring (Chrystal Guarasci)

Person Responsible

Chrystal Guarasci (chrystal.guarasci@polk-fl.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Building a positive culture for Tenoroc is very important and starts from within. We plan to support our students with incentives to encourage them and also reward them for going above and beyond. We plan to do this with our PBIS system that was started last year with tickets students can accumulate and earn rewards with. We plan to support our teachers with teacher of the month, opportunities to collaborate and being supportive to them inside the classroom. Tenoroc's positive culture also begins with building relationships with stakeholders. We know the importance of continuing and improving our relationship building. As we focus on campus behavior.

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

Business Partners:
Cindy Marsh (City of Lakeland)
Tranice McGriff (City of Lakeland)
Justin Kranitz (Davenport Chick-fil-a)