

Polk County Public Schools

Auburndale Senior High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Auburndale Senior High School

1 BLOODHOUND TRL, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://www.auburndalehighschool.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Tye Bruno

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | <p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p> |
| School Grades History | <p>2018-19: C (52%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (47%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (46%)</p> <p>2015-16: C (42%)</p> |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | [not available] |

* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Auburndale High School is to prepare our students to become successful in college, career, and citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Auburndale High School is to create an extraordinary environment that inspires greatness.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Bruno, Tye | Principal | Provides leadership and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement. Assigns and coordinates responsibilities for all leadership team members. |
| Mills, Jenn | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Curriculum. Assists the school principal by providing leadership and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement. |
| Wilder, Tyrone | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Administration. Assists the school principal by providing leadership and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement. |
| Graham, Lindsey | Assistant Principal | Assists the school principal by providing leadership and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement. |
| Lancaster, Pam | Dean | Responsible for student discipline. |
| Parada, Sheryl | Guidance Counselor | Lead guidance counselor |
| Giles, Joslyn | Graduation Coach | Monitors students to ensure they are receiving every opportunity to meet their graduation requirements and are successful in doing so. |
| Hilton, Leslie | Instructional Coach | The coach will provide support to teachers by modeling evidence based strategies, providing continuous professional development in PLCs throughout the year, utilizing small group instruction/teaming |
| Smith, Richard | Behavior Specialist | Behavior interventionist will focus on students with behaviors that lead to higher suspension rates. He will provide supports and strategies to improve student |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|------------------|--|
| | | behavior which will decrease the number of referrals and discipline actions for students. |
| Pike, Erin | Graduation Coach | Monitors students to ensure they are receiving every opportunity to meet their graduation requirements and are successful in doing so. |
| Jimenez, Evinery | Dean | Responsible for student discipline. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, Tye Bruno

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

0

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

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

80

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,639

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

17

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

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 376 | 498 | 373 | 390 | 1637 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 172 | 145 | 146 | 593 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 88 | 61 | 44 | 274 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 144 | 94 | 67 | 327 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 154 | 111 | 115 | 394 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 200 | 134 | 136 | 550 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 185 | 103 | 79 | 477 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 | 219 | 171 | 14 | 663 |

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 | 125 | 261 | 175 | 165 | 726 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 59 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 415 | 426 | 384 | 356 | 1581 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 73 | 75 | 73 | 270 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 98 | 59 | 46 | 293 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 94 | 40 | 152 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 104 | 34 | 167 |

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 | 109 | 108 | 76 | 64 | 357 |

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 | 35 | 17 | 5 | 12 | 69 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 9 | 17 | 68 |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 376 | 498 | 373 | 390 | 1637 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 172 | 145 | 156 | 603 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 88 | 61 | 44 | 274 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 144 | 94 | 67 | 327 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 154 | 111 | 115 | 394 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 200 | 134 | 136 | 550 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 185 | 103 | 79 | 477 |

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 | 125 | 261 | 175 | 165 | 726 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 59 |

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).

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 45% | -6% | 55% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 42% | -8% | 53% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 43% | 54% | -11% | 67% | -24% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 61% | 57% | 4% | 70% | -9% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 31% | 50% | -19% | 61% | -30% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 51% | 53% | -2% | 57% | -6% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- ELA Grades 9 - 11: STAR Reading Data used
- Math Grades 9 - 12: STAR Math Data used
- Biology: District Quarterly Assessment Data used
- US History: District Quarterly Assessment Data used

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 32% | 30% | 36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26% | 21% | 26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8% | 9% | 8% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 20% | 16% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 30% | 35% | 23% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20% | 24% | 15% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 13% | 2% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 18% | 5% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 43% | 32% | 29% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38% | 27% | 26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 5% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 27% | 8% | 8% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29% | 9% | 13% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 6% | 8% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 5% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 33% | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 50 | 42 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 30 | 30 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16 | 10 | 21 |
| | English Language Learners | 52 | 46 | 45 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 74 | 61 | 63 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 65 | 49 | 55 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 48 | 24 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 76 | 62 | 62 |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29% | 11% | 12% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 12% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 5% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 20% | 0 | 5% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 50% | 13% | 8% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 12% | 4% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 5% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 18% | 11% |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 12 | 35 | 33 | 16 | 20 | 11 | 21 | 26 | | 94 | 32 |
| ELL | 9 | 31 | 36 | 21 | 28 | 31 | 24 | 24 | | 86 | 70 |
| BLK | 18 | 34 | 35 | 10 | 20 | 17 | 21 | 43 | | 92 | 59 |
| HSP | 26 | 43 | 50 | 24 | 24 | 27 | 40 | 49 | | 85 | 71 |
| MUL | 65 | 56 | | 28 | 23 | | | 63 | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 41 | 39 | 32 | 34 | 21 | 20 | 58 | 64 | | 89 | 75 |
| FRL | 25 | 36 | 35 | 20 | 23 | 27 | 37 | 46 | | 86 | 60 |
| 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 | 18 | 28 | 23 | 36 | 69 | 67 | 26 | 55 | | 78 | 11 |
| ELL | 9 | 26 | 35 | 7 | | | 25 | 25 | | 73 | 50 |
| BLK | 23 | 32 | 30 | 31 | 47 | 40 | 29 | 55 | | 89 | 57 |
| HSP | 34 | 40 | 29 | 38 | 64 | 58 | 40 | 56 | | 84 | 60 |
| MUL | 39 | 41 | | 73 | 54 | | 69 | 67 | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 43 | 19 | 51 | 56 | 67 | 54 | 67 | | 86 | 62 |
| FRL | 25 | 32 | 24 | 35 | 51 | 50 | 39 | 55 | | 83 | 54 |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 23 | 36 | 31 | 26 | 47 | 42 | 33 | 33 | | 75 | 43 |
| ELL | 16 | 48 | 48 | 18 | 26 | 10 | 18 | 19 | | 78 | 67 |
| ASN | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 38 | 34 | 23 | 29 | 33 | 36 | 30 | | 84 | 62 |
| HSP | 37 | 42 | 32 | 39 | 35 | 17 | 45 | 49 | | 80 | 69 |
| MUL | 31 | 42 | | 23 | 33 | | 40 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 47 | 42 | 41 | 41 | 38 | 56 | 55 | | 85 | 69 |
| FRL | 32 | 40 | 36 | 33 | 36 | 32 | 41 | 44 | | 80 | 65 |

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) | [not available] |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 33 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 475 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 90% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 36 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 | 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 | 43 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 47 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |
| 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 |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

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

Trends noticed are ELA proficiency for our 9th and 10th students falls below the district average. Our ESSA ELL subgroup also falls below the district and state average. Student discipline incidents is higher across all grade levels when compared to the district and state average.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, the data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are ELA proficiency, ESSA ELL subgroup, and student discipline incidents.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement are poor student and teacher attendance, virtual learning, low performance from prior school year(s), lack of teacher knowledge of their content areas, and lack of teacher classroom management strategies.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is math proficiency.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement are common planning, utilizing formative assessments and analyzing data to drive instruction (reteaching), and utilization of LSI framework for instruction.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are instructional coach will push into classes to provide targeted support for students based on needs identified from teacher

feedback, progress monitoring, and district/state assessments. Supports utilized may include small group instruction, one-on-one intervention, and pull outs for specific support to increase student achievement in reading and writing. Common planning will be utilized, as well as increased professional development.

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.

Teachers will be provided professional development opportunities during monthly PLC. Our instructional coach will work with teachers during collaborative planning and also utilize Title I funds to pay for substitutes so teachers may take a full school day to effectively plan lessons centered around reading and writing integration which will improve student achievement. Teachers will also be provided professional development related to classroom management and improving student relationships.

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

The addition of a second student success coach will be implemented, as well as continuation of LSI strategies to ensure sustainability of improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The area of focus related to English Language Learners was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed as the Federal Index was 32%, which is below the target of 41%. |
| Measureable Outcome: | The desired outcome is that the ESSA subgroup of ELL students will increase proficiency from 32% to 41%. |
| Monitoring: | This Area of Focus will be monitored through student grades and state and district assessments, including WIDA, STAR assessments, LSI, WICOR strategies, and writing progress monitoring |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Leslie Hilton (leslie.hilton@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence-based strategy is to hire a teacher certified in ESOL, as well as a Spanish-speaking paraprofessional. In addition to assisting the ELL students, the ESOL teacher will provide support to the classroom teachers concerning the grades, progress, and ELL student needs. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | This strategy will assist ELL students by offering academic support in their native language(s) during their transition process into the English language. |

Action Steps to Implement

LY students will be placed in a sheltered Reading class.
 Common planning will be utilized to create target instruction lessons in ELA and Reading to meet the needs of LY students.
 ESOL teacher will check-in at least monthly with classroom teachers of LY students concerning grades, progress, and student needs.
 MTSS team will identify at-risk students and provide intervention.
 Testing Coordinator will ensure LY students receive appropriate accommodations during state and district testing.
 LY students will participate in college and career exploration, including field trips for exposure to post-secondary opportunities.
 Special activity supplies will be purchased to support family and parent engagement activities.
 Instructional technology will be purchased to support student academic needs.

Person Responsible Leslie Hilton (leslie.hilton@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This focus is a critical need because it is the data component that showed the lowest performance in 2019, with 37% of our students being proficient in ELA. Data from our high needs subgroup (ELL subgroup) also showed that in 2018, 16% of ELL students were proficient in ELA, which decreased to 9% proficient in 2019.

Measureable Outcome: The goal is to raise ELA proficiency from 37% to 42%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored through state and district assessments ,STAR, quarterly assessments, writing progress monitoring, student grades and artifacts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leslie Hilton (leslie.hilton@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: STAR assessments, LSI, WICOR strategies, formative and summative assessments, and writing progress monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategies were selected because they are aligned with our district goals. Our school data shows only 37% of our students are proficient with reading and literacy skills. ELA drives instruction in other subject areas. Once this area improves, other areas will show growth and improvement as well.

Action Steps to Implement

- School-based instructional coach will provide reading support for all staff based on determined needs through common planning and PLC.
- Students will be complete quarterly assessments to guide instruction.
- Common planning will be utilized to create target instruction lessons and in ELA and Reading to meet the needs of all students at all levels.
- Utilization of district learning maps and pacing guides and resources.
- Common board configurations for all classrooms.
- Administration will complete classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan checks, and review student test data to ensure students are making adequate progress.
- LY students will be placed in a sheltered Reading class.
- WICOR and LSI strategies will be used across content in all classes.
- Student data chats and tracking sheets will be utilized.
- District PD will be used to support teacher development and guide instructional activities.
- Student Success Coaches will closely monitor students, ensuring that they have every opportunity to meet their graduation requirements.

Person Responsible Leslie Hilton (leslie.hilton@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This is a critical need based on the data reported by SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, In the 2019-2020 school year, Auburndale High School reported 6.0 incidents per 100 students, compared to the state average of 3.3 incidents reported per 100 students. When compared to all high schools statewide, AHS falls into the "Very High" category. The category for "Violent Incidents" ranked "High", "Property Incidents" ranked "Very Low", and "Drug/Public Order Incidents" ranked "Very High" when compared to all high schools statewide. The total number of suspensions (in-school and out of school) reported for the 2018- 2019 was 557, 356 suspensions for 2019-2020, and 350 suspensions for 2020-2021.

Measureable Outcome: The total number of suspensions (in-school and out of school) reported for the 2018- 2019 was 557, 356 suspensions for 2019-2020, and 350 suspensions for 2020-2021. We will reduce the number of suspensions by 3%, for a total of 339 suspensions.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored through FOCUS data, including discipline referrals. Discipline team meetings will be held on a bi-weekly basis and discipline data will be reviewed. Student mentoring programs will be implemented through our behavior interventionist. We will be using Check and Connect to improve our relationships with students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tyrone Wilder (tyrone.wilder@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We used Title I funds to hire a Behavior Interventionist. He works closely with our at-risk and students with a high number of discipline referrals to create strategies for improved behavior. We are using a student incentive program to promote positive behavior, where teachers nominate a student each week by submitting a positive referral. An administrator follows up with a phone call to the parent, informing them of the positive referral. Teachers will receive professional development related to classroom management strategies and fostering positive school relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Behavior Interventionist will utilize strategies and supports to assist students in making positive behavior choices. Administrators will work closely with deans and the Behavior Interventionist to focus on eliminating behaviors associated with higher discipline referral rates.

Action Steps to Implement

Behavior interventionist will focus on targeted students with high discipline incidences and provide supports and strategies with behaviors identified that lead to higher suspension rates. This will lead to a decrease in the number of discipline incidents, discipline referrals, lower suspension rates, and improved student attendance rates for students in the targeted group. Teachers will receive professional development to assist with strategies in classroom management and improving student relationships. Bi-weekly discipline team meetings will be held to assess, evaluate, and analyze discipline data and current needs. Student mentoring programs will be utilized to improve student behavior.

Person Responsible Tyrone Wilder (tyrone.wilder@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Based on the data reported by SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, in the 2019-2020 school year, Auburndale High School reported 6.0 incidents per 100 students, compared to the state average of 3.3 incidents reported per 100 students. When compared to all high schools statewide, it falls into the "Very High" category. The category for "Violent Incidents" ranked "High", "Property Incidents" ranked "Very Low", and "Drug/Public Order Incidents" ranked "Very High" when compared to all high schools statewide.

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.

Auburndale High School works diligently to build positive relationships with all stakeholders that are involved at the school level. Our mission and vision are communicated to students, families, and stakeholders consistently through a variety of means. Methods utilized to keep parent involvement high and to keep them informed of their child's progress include:

- School Advisory Council (SAC) includes parent and community members and is open for any stakeholder to attend via virtually or face to face. Notices of these meetings appear on school social media, school webpage, are posted on the school marquis and are announced to students to inform their parents.
- Orientation is held the week prior to school which parents and students attend an orientation assembly, meet their teachers, and explore the various clubs/organizations available at school.
- Beginning of the year grade level assemblies are conducted to provide inspiration, motivation, and build relationships, as well as address school expectations.
- Mission Transition/Acceleration Night is held in the spring and allows for families to receive information on school courses, offerings, events, activities, and clubs.
- The school webpage includes a variety of school information including events, activities, code of conduct information, college and career preparation, standardized testing information, and links to teacher email addresses.
- The school maintains an active Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter Account. Updates are done on a regular basis.
- Parents who have opted-in to the School Messenger automated telephone system receive important announcements, reminders of upcoming events, and notification when their child is absent.
- Parent Internet Viewer allows parents to check their child's grades and attendance at any time.
- Athletic and other events are advertised to parents and are typically well attended by the entire

community.

- Meetings are held virtually if possible.

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

The school leadership team is comprised of all administration, Instructional Coach, Behavior Interventionist, Success Coaches, and Testing Coordinator. All leadership team members support the vision of the school by participating in continuous professional development and training, focusing on strategies to improve student performance, and by collaborating with staff to improve the school.

Part V: Budget

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |