Fivay High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fivay High School

12115 CHICAGO AVE, Hudson, FL 34669

https://fhs.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Erik Hermansen

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2022

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)	79%
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 (40%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Pasco 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

Fivay High School

12115 CHICAGO AVE, Hudson, FL 34669

https://fhs.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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 Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To ensure each of our students reach their highest potential, we are committed to excellence, dedicated to integrity, respectful, student-focused, promoting positive attitudes, and responsible members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Each Fivay student will be life, career, and college ready.

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
Hermansen, Erik	Principal	
Ashworth, Dena	Teacher, Adult	
Bell, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Bodnar, Nancy	Teacher, Adult	
Bullwinkel, Matthew	Graduation Coach	PLC Leader
Greco-Ball, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Riel, Denis	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Guiney, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Bonnell, Gloria	Teacher, K-12	
Mooney, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Rodriguez, Erica	Teacher, K-12	
Stipp, Sheri	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/29/2022, Erik Hermansen

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.*
1

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

105

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,546

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

28

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

28

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	433	371	397	345	1546
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	74	61	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	125	49	465
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	153	185	68	406
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	166	190	538
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250	290	158	698
ELA Course Failures Total School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	762	762
Math Course Failures Total School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364	364

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/29/2022

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	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 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	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 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	0	0	0	0		

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		
Students retained two or more times	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	28%	51%	51%				30%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						35%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						32%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	27%	35%	38%				29%	56%	51%
Math Learning Gains	41%						33%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						34%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	42%	50%	40%				43%	70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	49%	48%				47%	73%	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	43%	68%	-25%	67%	-24%
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	44%	69%	-25%	70%	-26%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	25%	60%	-35%	61%	-36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	35%	62%	-27%	57%	-22%

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	9	31	35	7	34	52	34	30		89	4
ELL	6	33	23	11	30	27	15	32		100	30
ASN								60			
BLK	21	35	35	16	33		27	38		94	16
HSP	22	36	29	21	36	37	43	41		94	25
MUL	47	44		47	52		35	57		100	4
WHT	30	38	38	31	44	53	46	58		96	22
FRL	26	36	33	24	38	44	38	46		96	20
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	13	41	42	13	23	28	26	28		80	3
ELL	11	37	41	18	33	45	24	8		77	24
ASN	18	50		40							
BLK	20	28	50	15	27	31	41	16		96	17
HSP	26	36	33	18	21	23	41	32		87	22
MUL	19	22		14	31		60	40		93	15
WHT	32	43	43	22	28	36	57	43		89	24
FRL	26	37	42	18	25	31	48	36		87	22
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	12	28	28	14	25	31	21	18		70	7
ELL	7	30	30	10	27		6	8			
BLK	17	23	33	19	42	46	21	45		75	33
HSP	30	32	33	27	35	38	39	38		76	22
MUL	34	43		44	30		71	31			
WHT	30	36	31	30	32	30	46	51		85	40
FRL	27	34	33	28	33	33	42	44		80	36

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
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	38
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	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	47
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	39
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?

Trends that are emerging in ELA are 73% below proficiency. In Math 71% are below proficiency.

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

Comprehension in ELA
Computation in Math

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

In the 2022-2023 school year there will be a focus on literacy in all content areas. This focus will provide students with a greater understanding of comprehension and understanding of content.

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

Math learning gains. Proficiency in US History EOC.

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

PLC structures were focused on student performance in Algebra and Geometry. There was also a focus on the lowest 35% students.

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

Continued focus on PLC cycle with an emphasis on question 2, How do we know student learned the standard and what do we do with them if they did not and did. There will also be a focus on literacy in all content areas to ensure that students will have the necessary strategies to succeed.

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.

Through learning walks, PD will be based on what is seen in the classroom. Additionally, there will be a WICOR focus each month so that students are exposed to various AVID strategies.

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

PLC structures will continue and refined as needed. The literacy focus will continue throughout the year and beyond.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
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 the 2022 state assessment data, there is a strong need for students to be exposed to literacy in all content areas. This will allow the students to comprehend what the assessments are asking them to answer. All teachers will participate in purposeful planning to develop and implement high impact instructional strategies (using the IPG tool) to engage students in classroom activities that match the rigor of the grade level standards. • PD will be delivered on using the IPG tool to plan for instruction to meet all core actions • Core academic PLCs will collaborate to produce CFAs and CSAs for each unit matching the rigor of the standards and housed in Sharepoint • Core PLCs will develop a remediation and extension plan for their essential standards • PD will be provided on Tier 2 classroom supports • An administrative walkthrough schedule using the IPG tool will be implemented to collect data • common standards-based grading practices will be developed and implemented
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	There will be a 10% increase in the students showing proficiency in ELA and Math based on state assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This focus area will be monitored through the walkthrough document and ongoing PD that will be conducted throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erik Hermansen (ehermans@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	
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.

Professional development through out the year.

Person Responsible   Erik Hermansen (ehermans@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Walk through data collection

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The following subgroups: black, Hispanic, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and English Language Learners all fall below the 41% for proficiency mark. FHS will support student learning and hold teachers accountable for using data and the CIA cycle to plan and implement instructional and remediation strategies to meet the needs of all students. • PLCs will keep data on CSAs to track progress and plan for remediation • SIT team will meet weekly to identify, support, and monitor progress of students identified as needing support • Grade level triads (administrator, counselor, and GEP) will meet a minimum of monthly to monitor the progress of their cohort and plan interventions PD will be provided around Differentiated instruction to support black, Hispanic, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and English Language Learners
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	All subgroups will raise to the 41% or above threshold on state assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	During PLC and SIT meetings, the student data will be reviewed to ensure that students are making progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erik Hermansen (ehermans@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	
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.	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Through professional development of teachers and staff there will be a focus on building relationships with students and parents. Through the relationship building process we will have positive interactions with students and have a better understanding of the students. FHS will also be utilizing the PBIS system throughout the school to promote positive behaviors and interactions amongst all students and staff.

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

Erik Hermansen- Principal
Jennifer Greco-Ball- Assistant Principal who oversees PBIS
Brian Borruso- Teacher overseeing the relationship with community members and organizing of staff recognition
School Advisory Counsel- assisting with the funding and recognition