

Pasco County Schools

Sunlake High School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Sunlake High School

3023 SUNLAKE BLVD, Land O Lakes, FL 34638

www.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Michael Cloyd

Start Date for this Principal: 5/6/2015

2018-19 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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Sunlake High School will provide a safe and challenging learning environment that promotes personal responsibility and empowers students to excel.

Provide the school's vision statement

Sunlake embraces high expectations for all and will:

*foster a collaborative culture

*engage in a safe, rigorous standards-based learning experience driven by data

*produce citizens prepared for college, career and life

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Cloyd, Michael	Principal
Principal	
Weber, Kelly	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Abbey, Eulala	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Ragusa, Sandee	Other
Other	
Hall, Karen	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Eshkov, Lisa	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Hock, Michelle	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Cullison, Anne	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Bennett, George	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Gallaher, Amity	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
O'Nolan, Tracie	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Adams, Tara	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Spera, Emily	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Finan, Jami	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Santiago, Edith	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Francis, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Wilson, Amy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Taylor, Colin	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Aguiar, Joshua	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	

Name	Title
Pake, Virginia	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Bylsma, Katheryn	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Simhan, Mala	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Elias, Doug	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Caldwell, Maribeth	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Stegura, Stacey	Teacher, Career/Technical
Teacher, Career/Technical	
Baer, Cady	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Byrd, Sharlene	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	456	504	476	528	1964
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	26	30	52	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	54	42	71	213
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	79	72	93	268
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	94	77	60	295

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	37	54	55	74	220

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

88

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	57%	56%	71%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	53%	51%	65%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	41%	42%	52%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	56%	51%	69%	57%	51%
Math Learning Gains	49%	49%	48%	58%	52%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	42%	45%	43%	41%	45%
Science Achievement	84%	70%	68%	79%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	73%	73%	77%	71%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	456 (0)	504 (0)	476 (0)	528 (0)	1964 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 ()	26 ()	30 ()	52 ()	135 (0)
One or more suspensions	46 ()	54 ()	42 ()	71 ()	213 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	24 ()	79 ()	72 ()	93 ()	268 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	64 ()	94 ()	77 ()	60 ()	295 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: A * in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to < 10 students tested or all students tested scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	69%	57%	12%	55%	14%
	2018	77%	55%	22%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	67%	53%	14%	53%	14%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

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
2019	83%	68%	15%	67%	16%
2018	78%	65%	13%	65%	13%
Compare		5%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	69%	3%	70%	2%
2018	76%	70%	6%	68%	8%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	60%	0%	61%	-1%
2018	72%	63%	9%	62%	10%
Compare		-12%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	62%	10%	57%	15%
2018	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
Compare		5%			

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	37	31	37	31	22	50	51		87	26
ELL	37	61	50	40	38		80	21		80	33
ASN	72	64		59	58		90	64		95	70
BLK	71	57		58	48	54	69	69		93	33

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	64	57	41	60	44	33	78	67		94	56
MUL	55	42	26	60	28		78	77		79	64
WHT	71	60	43	74	52	49	87	75		95	59
FRL	61	55	44	57	43	29	77	55		87	46

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	26	52	46	33	38	38	39	49		84	30
ELL	22	36	35	50	41		45			62	
ASN	81	74		79	58		89			88	86
BLK	71	60	53	57	50	43	74	74		92	43
HSP	67	67	55	65	59	36	74	68		90	56
MUL	67	59		72	69		83	75		94	67
WHT	72	64	51	72	57	47	81	80		90	62
FRL	61	65	54	60	61	44	69	67		89	50

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	673
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	48

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
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	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	57
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	67
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Data for the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math was below 50%. While the data in Math for the lowest 25% remained the same (43%), the lowest 25% data in ELA drop by 12 percentage points from the previous year with only 40% of the lowest 25% showing a learning gain in ELA.. Contributing factors to this data include teachers planning for interventions without knowledge of which students were in the lowest 25%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

ELA data for the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline with a 12 percentage point drop from the previous year. Contributing factors to this decline include teachers planning for interventions without knowledge of which students were in the lowest 25%. In addition to the L25 ELA decline, Algebra EOC scores also declined 12 percentage points from the previous year. Factors that contributed to this decline include a temporary teacher and loose monitoring of standards mastery.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Data for the lowest 25% in ELA had the largest gap compared to the state average. There was not a solid plan for monitoring the ongoing performance of and intervening with the lowest 25% last year.

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

Science scores, specifically Biology, showed the greatest improvement over the prior year.

Sunlake High School implemented an extended learning period one day per week to address essential standards that were not yet mastered by students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Students with Disabilities

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Math Learning Gains (Algebra)
3. Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Data Driven Decisions- Students With Disabilities
Rationale	The proficiency of our Students With Disabilities is currently 40%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

By the end of the 2019-2020 school year the proficiency of our Students With Disabilities will be at least 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kara Merlin (kmerlin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

The ESE PLC will meet weekly to monitor student data and create intervention and support plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Closer monitoring of student performance will enable teachers to make timely intervention decisions to support student mastery of content. The Extended Learning (XL) period will be used to support this strategy as it provides time within the school day to target areas where students are not making progress.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share ESE school-wide data and individual data 2. Create weekly structures for meeting 3. Create a calendar for monitoring data 4. Use an intervention planning template and data tracking system to monitor effectiveness of interventions
Person Responsible	Lisa Eshkov (leshkov@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

- 1- High Impact Instruction- Ensure that all students receive rigorous, standards-based instruction and supports.
*Teachers will plan and deliver lesson that are aligned to the rigor of the standards, reflect the instructional

shifts and integrate the FEAPs.

*Increase participation in AP, DE and Academies with an increase in industry certification by 5%.

2- Collaborative Culture- Promote, support and sustain a positive school culture that involves all staff and students.

*Student Engagement will increase as evidenced by a 10% attendance improvement, an increase in graduation rate and a 10% decrease in OSS. A focus on learning through goal setting, an increase in a

variety of earned privileges, an increased use of alternatives to suspension and additional opportunities for

students to take assessments with concordant scores to satisfy graduation requirements will be implemented

to achieve this goal.

*Staff Engagement will increase as evidenced by improved attendance rates. Staff will provide each other

with increased opportunities for fun at work and administration will increase celebrations of outstanding staff

contributions. *PLCs will use grade level data to discuss student needs, plan interventions for students and

participate in professional development.

*Our school will improve communication systems through calendar meetings, weekly parent phone

messages, the use of a text based app for family and community outreach and a weekly staff newsletter.

3- Data Driven Decisions- Create, implement and monitor proactive systems and structures that ensure the needs of all students are met.

*School support teams will identify, support and monitor the lowest 35% of students through the use of

MTSS, grade level teams, weekly PLCs and our XL intervention period.

*PLCs will use grade level data to discuss student needs and plan and monitor interventions for students

through the continued use of our weekly XL period.

*Student action plans will be created during the XL period using data from CFAs, District Quarterly Checks,

myEWS and MyGrad Success. XL

teachers will mentor students during XL periods to ensure success with their action plans.

*Students who miss 10+ days of school will be identified by grade level leaders and provided with supports to

increase attendance by mentor teachers.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

N/A- Sunlake is not a Title I school.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

N/A- Sunlake is not a Title I school.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

N/A- Sunlake is not a Title I school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

N/A- Sunlake is not a Title I school.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A- Sunlake is not a Title I school.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Data Driven Decisions- Students With Disabilities	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00