

Pinellas County Schools

East Lake 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	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

East Lake High School

1300 SILVER EAGLE DR, Tarpon Springs, FL 34688

<http://www.eastlake-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Carmela Haley C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	24%
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: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Pinellas 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 community of East Lake High School will develop productive and responsible students who are prepared for post-secondary education, the workforce, and citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% student success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Haley, Carmela	Principal
Principal	
Csaszar, Katherine	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Toscani, Kris	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Anderson, Shawn	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Latimore, Dwight	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	

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	657	576	594	517	2344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	69	111	112	378
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	26	19	18	93
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	59	60	5	217
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	107	77	43	307

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	40	83	57	57	237

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

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

100

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

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	118	155	146	174	593
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	20	24	11	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	60	61	16	231
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	78	43	4	232

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	80	56	52	14	202

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	69%	56%	56%	71%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	51%	51%	57%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	43%	42%	50%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	45%	51%	61%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains	58%	44%	48%	53%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	41%	45%	41%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	79%	64%	68%	82%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	71%	73%	85%	72%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	657 (0)	576 (0)	594 (0)	517 (0)	2344 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	86 ()	69 ()	111 ()	112 ()	378 (0)
One or more suspensions	30 (0)	26 (0)	19 (0)	18 (0)	93 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	93 (0)	59 (0)	60 (0)	5 (0)	217 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	80 (0)	107 (0)	77 (0)	43 (0)	307 (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: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	72%	54%	18%	55%	17%
	2018	71%	53%	18%	53%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	66%	53%	13%	53%	13%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	53%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-4%		
Cohort Comparison				-5%		

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	78%	62%	16%	67%	11%
2018	81%	63%	18%	65%	16%
Compare				-3%	

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	86%	70%	16%	70%	16%
2018	85%	70%	15%	68%	17%
Compare				1%	

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	55%	-13%	61%	-19%
2018	46%	57%	-11%	62%	-16%
Compare				-4%	

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	56%	13%	57%	12%
2018	70%	56%	14%	56%	14%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-1%			

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	38	41	40	41	44	26	40	53		100	41
ELL	27	48	52	32	67	60	62	45		100	64
ASN	80	54		74	76		91	73		100	75
BLK	51	54	38	34	44		62	71		100	33
HSP	56	51	47	54	56	33	69	75		100	72
MUL	84	61		78	73		95	88		100	83
WHT	72	55	45	63	58	43	80	89		100	76
FRL	58	52	46	51	50	36	67	72		98	61

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	41	51	39	38	38	39	55	59		78	34
ELL	27	33	33	33	35			64			
ASN	71	64		85	63		90	94		100	69
BLK	47	45	32	38	33	15	65	61		96	35
HSP	60	52	49	51	44	50	78	78		89	63
MUL	86	63	73	63	60		81	95		100	60
WHT	73	58	51	64	55	40	83	87		98	67
FRL	58	53	44	54	47	41	73	78		91	54

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	66
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	728
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	56
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	78
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	54
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	61
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	83
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	
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	68
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	60
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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was student proficiency rate on the Algebra EOC. East Lake High School went from 46% of students achieving a level 3 or higher in 2018 to 42% in 2019.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is from the Algebra EOC. There was a decline of 4% in the number of students achieving a level 3 or higher.

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

There were no gaps when comparing school data and state averages.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the learning gains for math with our lowest 25%. There was an increase of 5%.

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

There was an increase in the number of students receiving a score of Level 1 on the statewide assessment.

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

1. Algebra 1 performance data
2. 10th grade ELA
3. Students with Disabilities performance data
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 41% on the Algebra 1 EOC as evidenced by EOC performance data. By teachers effectively implementing standards based planning, instruction, and rigor, our level of performance would increase by 5%, becoming 46%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving math assessment proficiency will increase from 41% to 46% as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing staff capacity to identify critical content and align with district resources and use data to make instructional decisions to meet the needs of students will allow for standards based planning, standards based instruction, and increased rigor.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development training to build content knowledge requirements and resources. 2. Appropriate placement and scheduling of students and adherence to the district mathematics progression flowchart. 3. PLCs will collaboratively implement standards-based planning utilizing data to determine instructional needs. 4. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review student data following cycle assessments to help drive instruction and use common assessments using EOC test item specifications and question types. 5. EOC Boot camps during Summer Bridge for Algebra 1 and Geometry.
Person Responsible	Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	English Language Arts/Reading
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 66% on the 10th grade ELA assessment as evidenced by FSA data. By teachers effectively implementing standards based planning, instruction, and rigor, our level of performance would increase by 5%, becoming 71%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving proficiency will increase from 66% to 71% as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing staff capacity to identify critical content and align with district resources and use data to make instructional decisions to meet the needs of students will allow for standards based planning, standards based instruction, and increased rigor.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literacy Leadership Team is providing regular staff PD (monthly staff and department meetings and weekly PLC meetings) on the use of literacy strategies that can be implemented in all content area classrooms. 2. Schedule students into appropriate Reading, English, English Honors, or AP and College classes. 3. PLCs will collaboratively implement standards-based planning utilizing data to determine instructional needs. 4. Teachers will work in PLCs to determine the most appropriate and highest yielding instructional strategies for their respective content areas. Teachers will work with district personnel to access resources, professional development, support, and feedback for improvement.
Person Responsible	Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

#3**Title**

Science

Rationale

Our current level of performance is 79% as evidenced by the Biology EOC performance data. The problem/gap is occurring because the use of standards-based planning, instruction, and rigor is progressing from beginning to effective. If regular professional development and the daily use of Standards Based Planning and Instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5% and our current level of performance would be 84%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

The percent of all students achieving proficiency will increase from 79% to 84% as measured by Biology EOC performance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Increasing staff capacity to identify critical content and align with district resources and use data to make instructional decisions to meet the needs of students will allow for standards based planning, standards based instruction, and increased rigor.

Action Step**Description**

1. Teachers will work with district personnel to access resources, professional development, support, and feedback for improvement.
2. PLCs will collaboratively implement standards-based planning focusing upon collaborative lessons, student centered learning, teaching strategies and utilizing cycle assessment data to meet the needs of students.
3. The Science department will receive training to analyze and track specific data for students utilizing a variety of data such as cycle assessment results.
4. Biology teachers will continue to differentiate science instruction after disaggregating cycle assessment data to meet the needs of students by using biology station rotations and small group instruction..

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#4	
Title	Social Studies
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 86% on the US History EOC as evidenced by EOC performance data. By teachers effectively implementing standards based planning, instruction, and rigor, our level of performance would increase 5%, becoming 91%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving proficiency will increase from 86% to 91% as measured by US History EOC performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kris Toscani (toscanik@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing staff capacity to identify critical content and align with district resources and use data to make instructional decisions to meet the needs of students will allow for standards based planning, standards based instruction, and increased rigor.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. US History PLC will meet to discuss and disaggregate district common assessment data following the release of each cycle assessment. 2. Social studies team members will work with the district Social Studies instructional coach and ISM team to identify resources, literacy strategies, AVID strategies, and ideas for differentiated and scaffolded instruction. 3. PLCs will collaboratively implement standards-based planning utilizing data to determine instructional needs.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5	
Title	College and Career Readiness
Rationale	Our lagging data is 74% and our current level of performance is 62% as evidenced by the College and Career Acceleration Index. By teachers effectively implementing standards based planning, instruction, and rigor, our level of performance would increase 5%, becoming 67%. .
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students successfully completing an acceleration/ advanced course will increase from 62% to 67%, as measured by completion and industry certification data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carmela Haley (haleyc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance access to opportunities for students to engage in advanced/ acceleration coursework. Intensify staff capacity to support students in completing and attaining industry certification. Strengthen teacher implementation for rigorous instructional practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Providing additional opportunities for student to engage in advanced/ accelerated coursework will allow for additional students to have the opportunity for completion and industry certification.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regular staff professional development for teachers, counselors and administrators, to increase student participation in rigorous classes and preparation for student exams and assessments. 2. Monitor academic schedules and progression plans to increase enrollment in CTE, DE, and AP classes. 3. Enroll students in IT directed study courses to assist in the completion of an industry certification. 4. Monitor college and career readiness data for all students.
Person Responsible	Carmela Haley (haleyc@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 34.3% on the (10th grade ELA) and 25.9% (Algebra 1 EOC) based on Spring 2019 FSA and EOC data. By continuing to increase school staff awareness of student IEP goals and effective methods of provision of supports, services and accommodations for students with disabilities, our level of performance would increase by 5%, becoming 39.3% (10th grade ELA) and 30.9% (Algebra 1 EOC).
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving proficiency will increase from 34.3% (ELA) to 39% as measured by FSA ELA and 25.9% to 30% (Algebra 1 EOC).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of meaningful IEP goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When school staff have an increased understanding of IEP goals and providing supports, services and accommodations students have increased opportunities for success. This understanding and awareness from staff is essential in the progression of learning for students with disabilities.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development opportunities for school staff regarding understanding IEP goals, supports, and services. 2. Ensure rigorous texts, materials, and content are accessible to students with disabilities and supplementary aides and services are provided. 3. Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and service delivery.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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)

East Lake High School continues to maintain a 100% graduation rate through the use of standards based planning, standards based instruction, and maintaining rigor. This includes providing scaffolding and support wherever needed, addressing the needs of black student achievement, monitoring attendance rates, continued family and community engagement, and ensuring healthy schools initiatives stay in place.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts/Reading	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Social Studies	\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: College and Career Readiness	\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$10,573.05