

Pinellas County Schools

Hospital/Homebound



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Hospital/Homebound

2235 NE COACHMAN RD, Clearwater, FL 33765

<http://it.pinellas.k12.fl.us/schools/homebound/>

Demographics

Principal: Suzette Burns

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
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)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19:
School Grades History	2017-18:
	2016-17: I
	2015-16: I
	2014-15: I
	2013-14:
ESSA Status	CS&I

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

Our mission is to educate and inspire all students to succeed.

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
Burns, Suzette	Principal
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	2	5	8	2	6	8	12	16	17	23	39	20	37	195
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	2	4	0	0	14

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/4/2019

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	0%	70%	61%	0%	65%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	59%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	54%	0%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	72%	62%	0%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	64%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	59%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	64%	56%	0%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	81%	78%	0%	82%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	2 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	12 (0)	16 (0)	17 (0)	23 (0)	39 (0)	20 (0)	37 (0)	195 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	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 (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 (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)	3 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (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
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	52%	-52%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	70%	55%	15%	56%	14%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison		70%				
09	2019	68%	54%	14%	55%	13%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		68%				
Cohort Comparison		30%				
10	2019	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
	2018	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	27%	59%	-32%	54%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	62%	31%	31%	46%	16%
	2018	0%	31%	-31%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	51%	-1%	48%	2%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		50%				
Cohort Comparison		50%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	62%	3%	67%	-2%
2018	39%	63%	-24%	65%	-26%
Compare		26%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	68%	-18%	71%	-21%
2018	42%	66%	-24%	71%	-29%
Compare		8%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	70%	-11%	70%	-11%
2018	84%	70%	14%	68%	16%
Compare		-25%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	55%	-22%	61%	-28%
2018	36%	57%	-21%	62%	-26%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	56%	-24%	57%	-25%
2018	53%	56%	-3%	56%	-3%
Compare		-21%			

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

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	199
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	63%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	41
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	21
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Economically Disadvantaged Students

Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%

1

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

50% of our students performed at a level 1 or 2 on the FSA ELA assessment.

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

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

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

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

Increase attendance

Increase rigor of current classes

Monitor more closely students preparing to graduate

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

1. Increase attendance of students in distance learning classes
2. Increase the rigor of current distance learning classes
3. Increase on time graduation rate
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase attendance in distance learning classes
Rationale	When students attend classes the opportunity to learn and make progress is increased.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student attendance in distance learning classes will be at 85% or better.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzette Burns (burnss@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase teacher communication and documentation for contacting families.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Personal contact from teachers has been shown to increase student attendance when students know adults care they are apt to more attentive and involved in their education.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will contact students who have not shown to class for two class periods 2. Emails and phone calls will be logged in focus to document contact/result of communication 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
#2	
Title	Increase rigor in distance learning classes
Rationale	Increasing the rigor in classes will increase the number of students meeting a level 3 or above in
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzette Burns (burnss@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3

Title

Increase number of students graduating on time.

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Suzette Burns (burnss@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

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)

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

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

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

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

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase attendance in distance learning classes	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase rigor in distance learning classes	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase number of students graduating on time.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00