

Escambia County School District

West Florida High School/Technical



2020-21 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	13
Positive Culture & Environment	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

West Florida High School/Technical

150 E BURGESS RD, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.ecsd-fl.schoolloop.com

Demographics

Principal: Shenna Payne

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Escambia 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

West Florida High School of Advanced Technology is an innovative high school focused on providing a unique, comprehensive, useful education that will lead to lifelong personal, career and professional accomplishments.

The mission of West Florida High School of Advanced Technology is to prepare students for entry into chosen career fields or higher educational pursuits through incorporation of quality learning experienced by integration of academic and technical skills.

Provide the school's vision statement

West Florida High School of Advanced Technology is a community of learners made up of students, school staff, family, community and business partners who work together to empower students to take responsibility for their learning thereby increasing their options after high school. Our standards-based curriculum is constantly evolving to meet the diverse needs of our students, challenging them to grow to their fullest potential, thus producing dynamic citizens ready for college and/or career.

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
Payne, Shenna	Principal	
Eshelman, William	Teacher, K-12	
Hurst, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
McFarland, Angela	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Nesbitt, Marvetta	Guidance Counselor	
Thomas, Terry	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Strother, Cody	Assistant Principal	
Cramer, Erin	Assistant Principal	
Simmons, Rachel	Dean	
Novotny, Cheyenna	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2020, Shenna Payne

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.*

1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Demographic Data

2020-21 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)	40%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

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	400	314	288	290	1292
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	18	24	23	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	13	11	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	26	15	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	14	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	19	24	23	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	34	1	0	84

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	1	12	18	21	52

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	3	1	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - 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	372	311	321	331	1335
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	14	28	26	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	26	33	26	108
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	24	45	28	143
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	36	47	32	193

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	16	26	41	24	107

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

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	372	311	321	331	1335
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	14	28	26	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	26	33	26	108
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	24	45	28	143
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	36	47	32	193

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	16	26	41	24	107

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

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	70%	49%	56%	68%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	47%	51%	64%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	33%	42%	54%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	42%	51%	64%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains	56%	48%	48%	68%	51%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	41%	45%	52%	40%	45%
Science Achievement	79%	59%	68%	77%	60%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	62%	73%	83%	69%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	70%	48%	22%	55%	15%
	2018	69%	49%	20%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	70%	48%	22%	53%	17%
	2018	68%	49%	19%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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	79%	58%	21%	67%	12%
2018	77%	57%	20%	65%	12%
Compare		2%			
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	87%	62%	25%	70%	17%
2018	83%	65%	18%	68%	15%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	52%	9%	61%	0%
2018	56%	51%	5%	62%	-6%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	47%	14%	57%	4%
2018	67%	48%	19%	56%	11%
Compare		-6%			

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	35	50	37	44	60		53	77			
ASN	76	58		100	75		95	92		100	100
BLK	54	58	43	44	46	58	64	72		99	60
HSP	73	79		56			87	100		100	71
MUL	73	67	58	66	52		86	89		100	64
WHT	79	66	51	72	59	61	84	97		100	80
FRL	60	57	41	53	56	68	73	81		99	72

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	35	56	50	36	55		61	46		100	64
ASN	84	83		83	75		88				
BLK	50	60	55	45	49	37	60	70		98	63
HSP	68	61		50	61		84	94		100	94
MUL	77	63		83	90		90	89		95	95
WHT	78	65	49	74	74	66	85	89		100	82
FRL	56	57	53	55	58	36	69	75		98	69

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	701
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
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	60
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	81
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	73
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	75
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	66
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

Our Algebra Learning Gains for the lowest 25% were a bit lower than normal, but still above the District and State averages. Teacher turnover in this area could be a contributing factor. I don't see any trends; this slight dip is hopefully an anomaly.

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

Our scores on the Geometry EOC dropped 6%, but are still above District and State averages. This could possibly be attributed to the 11th and 12th graders still in Geometry.

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

We are consistently much higher than state averages on Biology and US History EOCs. This is a positive trend, attributable to the great work of our teachers.

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

Our overall proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC increased by 5%. We stressed collaboration with colleagues, both on our campus, and at the District level.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our Level 1s in both math and ELA are of concern.

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

1. Increase Learning Gains for lowest quartile in Algebra.
2. Decrease number of ELA level 1s in ninth grade.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We would like to increase learning gains for our lowest 25% in Algebra 1. As the Algebra 1 EOC is a requirement for graduation, we must focus on our lowest-performing students. This was identified as an area of need based on the fact that only 49% of our lowest quartile in Algebra 1 exhibited learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: We plan to raise the percentage of our lowest quartile students who achieve math learning gains to above 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cody Strother (cstrother@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will work on teaching student to intentionally choose from alternative algebraic strategies when solving problems. This strategy teaches student to vary their approaches to problem solving. Students know the necessary steps to solve a given problem, and also a rationale as to the use and effectiveness of the steps they've chosen.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We selected this strategy based on it's positive effect size on performance, relative to other strategies. This strategy has shown moderate success, as opposed to little or no success. the document, "Teaching Strategies for Improving Algebra Knowledge in Middle and High School Students" was used to determine the efficacy of this and other strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Math Department head will share strategies and attend cohort meetings monthly. Algebra 1 teachers will meet with their cohort, as well as with District level specialists, to work on strategies to improve learning gains of our lowest quartile. Monitoring will take place on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Hurst (shurst@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We would like to see a decrease in the number of ELA level 1s in our school. We will do this through implementation of College Board's Pre-AP curriculum for English 9. Our English 9 teachers will work collaboratively with our reading department to share best practices, identify and remediate level 1s. All Level 1s will be placed in an Intensive Reading class. Progress will be monitored through quarterly STAR360 assessments.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We operate under what is called "The West Florida Way" here at West Florida High School of Advanced Technology. The West Florida Way is a mindset in which all stakeholders, administration, teachers, students, ESPs, parents, and community partners are valued and treated with respect and dignity. We hold ourselves to a high standard of behavior and performance in the classroom, the hallways, on sporting fields, and in the community. We focus on the details which have made us successful: work ethic, discipline, integrity and a sense of family, where everyone is important. We avoid unilateral decision making, opting for a more collaborative approach in which we solicit advice from the "boots on the ground" (teachers, students, parents) as we make decisions for the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00