

Pinellas County Schools

Largo 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	20

Largo High School

410 MISSOURI AVE N, Largo, FL 33770

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

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Finkbiner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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)	52%
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: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: C
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	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 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

PRIDE: Positive Rigorous Instruction Designed to Empower scholars' learning and success in post-secondary endeavors promoting civic engagement, global understanding, and a respect for individuals and societies.

Provide the school's vision statement

Prepare 100% of our scholars for post-secondary success by providing a quality education

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Finkbiner, Bradley Principal	Principal
Marina, Jonathan Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Green, Ryan Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Liem, Alec Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Ray, Linda 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	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	142	114	101	453
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	55	25	15	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	108	83	6	310
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	206	128	72	562

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	183	149	123	91	546

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	50	51	32	4	137
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	6

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

89

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/29/2019

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	151	121	128	108	508
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	30	15	10	107
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	261	200	155	921
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	147	126	67	498

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	183	149	123	93	548

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	58%	56%	56%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	51%	51%	51%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	43%	42%	42%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	39%	45%	51%	46%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains	44%	44%	48%	51%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	45%	38%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	64%	64%	68%	72%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	71%	73%	71%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	96 ()	142 ()	114 ()	101 ()	453 (0)
One or more suspensions	26 (0)	55 (0)	25 (0)	15 (0)	121 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	113 (0)	108 (0)	83 (0)	6 (0)	310 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	156 (0)	206 (0)	128 (0)	72 (0)	562 (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	57%	54%	3%	55%	2%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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	64%	62%	2%	67%	-3%
2018	71%	63%	8%	65%	6%
Compare		-7%			

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	71%	70%	1%	70%	1%
2018	69%	70%	-1%	68%	1%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	55%	-31%	61%	-37%
2018	35%	57%	-22%	62%	-27%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	56%	-5%	57%	-6%
2018	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-4%			

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	10	38	44	8	32	38	15	27		80	13
ELL	23	41	35	23	42	43	39	28		94	38
ASN	86	60		65	47		92	86		100	86
BLK	29	47	40	20	34	33	31	37		93	31
HSP	44	52	43	34	45	44	49	62		92	39
MUL	50	43	47	31	39		68	59		100	27
WHT	69	58	51	51	47	41	79	83		88	49
FRL	41	49	44	30	38	35	46	54		86	34

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	13	37	39	21	32	23	33	47		72	13
ELL	13	39	42	35	49		18	43		73	27
ASN	84	69		64	58		98	91		97	86
BLK	24	36	33	30	37	32	46	48		81	17
HSP	35	42	47	44	57	26	54	52		90	39
MUL	45	61	52	31	39		61	57		89	13
WHT	64	55	41	54	56	50	80	79		84	44
FRL	38	47	41	40	46	34	62	58		82	31

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	40
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	51
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	52
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	62
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	46
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

Mathematics L25 experienced a 7 point decline in achievement as compared to last year.

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

Mathematics Achievement and Learning Gains declined 7 points each this year as compared to last year,

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 experienced the largest gap when compared to the State average in our performance in the Algebra EOC exam. The school performed 27% below the State average. (LHS- 35%, State 62%).

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

Our school experienced the most improvement in the ELA Achievement category. We gained 4% in ELA overall achievement, 4% in ELA Learning gains and 3% in L25 gains.

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

Proficiency in Math and Biology
Attendance

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

1. Attendance
2. Decrease subgroup gaps
3. Career and College Acceleration cell

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	As a result of our year end Attendance Rate for All Students at 91%, we are going to be implementing more tiered attendance supports for our scholars. These supports will be discussed in our Child Study Team meetings and monitored monthly.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increased Average Daily Attendance to 95%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the Implementation of Tier 3 interventions to address and support the needs of scholars. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we can identify barriers
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CST monitors bi-weekly attendance 2. A specific process for teachers to be case managers for one period in regards to attendance will be implemented. 3. Rewards will be given to the most improved class or individuals on a monthly basis 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Alec Liem (liema@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	<p>ELA Achievement</p> <p>1. Our current level of performance is 57% in achievement, 55% in gains, and 45% in L25 gains as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA ELA results.</p> <p>2. We expect our performance level of performance is 63% in achievement, 61% in gains, and 51% in L25 gains as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA ELA results.</p>
Rationale	<p>3. The problem/gap is occurring because we are not implementing high leverage practices and strategies with fidelity across the department, making sure that the needs of learners are driving differentiation and learning.</p> <p>4. If high leverage, effective strategies are implemented with consistency across the department, learning gains will increase by at least 6%.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>1. The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 57% to 63%, as measured by Spring 2020 FSA ELA results.</p> <p>2. The percent of all students demonstrating ELA learning gains will increase from 55% to 61%, as measured by Spring 2020 FSA ELA results.</p> <p>3. The percent of our L25 students demonstrating ELA learning gains will increase from 45% to 51%, as measured by Spring 2020 FSA ELA results.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	<p>Ryan Green (greenry@pcsb.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.</p> <p>2. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.</p> <p>3. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content.</p> <p>4. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Focusing on the successful strategies that led to increased performance in all measured areas for ELA, professional development will be provided by administration, staff developers, and teacher leaders to support increased fidelity implementing evidence-based strategies.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. ELA and Reading teachers will work together during common planning and PLCs to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps.</p> <p>site based PD with district personnel</p> <p>2. Second semester implementation of a honors level course for level 3 readers in grades 9 and 10.</p> <p>3. Teachers meet in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) at least once per month to review student work in order to effectively implement remediation through text-dependent questions, close reading activities, and deliberate grouping during core instruction to improve comprehension of complex texts.</p> <p>4. ELA and Reading teachers will participate in site based professional development guided by district staff developers focusing on differentiation</p>

and engaging students in complex tasks.

5. Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the reading workshop model - including the use of grade appropriate complex texts in reading intervention classes, typically during small group instruction.

6. Using culturally relevant supplemental texts including AVID Weekly, teachers regularly include shorter, challenging passages that elicit close reading and re-reading to formatively assess, monitor, and inform instruction.

7. ELA and Reading teachers work together to conduct data chats with students (using data from Write Score, reading programs, and the FSA) in order to support students with setting and monitoring progress towards learning goals; create action plans and next steps; and adjust instruction.

Person Responsible Ryan Green (greenry@pcsb.org)

#3

Title Mathematics Proficiency

Rationale Largo High had an decrease in algebra and geometry.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve Increase overall mathematics proficiency from 39% to 45%
Increase learning gains to be over 50% overall and for our L25's

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Be more intentional with scholar data to ensure they have a learning gain of at least one year.
We believe this will help our proficiency as well for the upward movement of all scholars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy We believe there needed to be a more specific focus on all scholars in math.
Using an intentional plan developed by the department, with monitoring, we will see progress in each of our math courses.

Action Step

Description 1. common planning for all math instructors - Use PLC's to monitor progress every two weeks.
2. More targeted study groups and tutoring for math.
3. Add in incentives for scholars to choose after school tutoring
4. Use teacher swaps for those who may need a different voice saying the same thing.
5. ESE small group pull out with certified instructor - common skill gap group

Person Responsible Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Science
Rationale	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the proficiency score on the Bio EOC from from 64% to 70%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bradley Finkbiner (finkbinerb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources 2. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help elaborate on content
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies will assist us with increasing our performance on the FSA EOC for Biology
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PLC structure for common planning to meet each two weeks 2. Administrator assigned to the EOC and will monitor data and will be part of the PLC - to monitor implementation of district scope, sequence, and materials. 3. Teachers use district resources and exemplar lessons to support elaboration. 4. Teachers regularly incorporate knowledge checks (formative assessments) and use collected data to gauge student progress toward the mastery of the course content.
Person Responsible	Jon Marina (marinaj@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Social Studies
Rationale	Increase overall performance of scholars in US History as measured by the EOC
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase overall performance from 70% to 75% proficiency as measured on the US History EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers engage students in culturally responsive instructional practices that support movement, collaboration, and accountable talk using the WICOR learning support structure to raise achievement levels and close the achievement gap in social studies 2. Social studies teachers will utilize data to develop scaffolding for students and for the development of differentiated instructional practices to increase student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe with this collaboration and input of strategies, we will see improved scores
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common planning for US History instructors to hold PLC's every two weeks 2. Include AVID strategies into daily lesson plans to support all students and their levels 3. Instructors will incorporate knowledge checks and use data to gauge progress 4. Teachers meet in monthly PLC's to review student data (common assessments, quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement; or to develop lessons that meet rigor of the course benchmarks.
Person Responsible	Alec Liem (liema@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Acceleration
Rationale	LHS has a low number for this cell. Our plan is to improve by double digit percentages to be above 70% this year and 80% the following year
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	56%-70%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alec Liem (liema@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increased progress monitoring for all AP and Industry Certification courses For AP courses specifically utilized new AP College Board resources and the progress monitoring resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We need to continue to increase our Accelerated component and qualifying scores.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School counselors have scholars in courses needed to check off this box. 2. Monitoring will take place over AP practice tests 3. Monitoring and predictive scores will be seen in industry certifications and AP courses 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Alec Liem (liema@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	ESE
Rationale	LHS expectation is for ESE instructors will collaborate with General Education subject area instructors through PLC's to know the pacing guide for each subject which will allow them to better support thier scholars.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA and Math focus</p> <p>ELA proficiency will raise from 13% to 26% for ESE scholars Math proficiency will raise from 21% to 42%for ESE scholars</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use ESE co-teachers in Algebra and Geometry classes to do pull-outs and groups to better scholar skills
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe this approach will make the scholars more at ease and will show more learning gains as they increase their skills
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. implementation of SIM strategies for ELA and Math 2. Ensure appropriate services for ESE scholars 3. Build in collaborative PLC's during the day for instructors to meet every two weeks 4. ESE subject area instructors will be embedded in with General Ed. PLC's 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#8	
Title	EL
Rationale	Increase EL performance on all assessments
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the performance of our EL population from 42%-47%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bradley Finkbiner (finkbinerb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define our school approach to educating English Learners 2. Monitor EL Core Grades in academic subject areas
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. Ensure all EL's have been identified for appropriate support.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize Ellevation to obtain : EL numbers by EL status (LY, LF, LA, LZ). 2. Utilize monitoring document for core teachers to document EL academic grades. <p>- Implement "Grading of EL's Document" to provide additional resources to teachers for EL success.</p>
Person Responsible	Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)
#9	
Title	Mathematics Learning Gains
Rationale	Increase overall mathematics performance and learning gains across algebra and geometry courses.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of scholars showing learning gains from 38% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bradley Finkbiner (finkbinerb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Mathematics teachers implement instruction to support student success MAFS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LHS experienced a decline in overall Mathematics performance in the 18-19 school year based on FSA performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured Common Planning- Focus on Teachers building their content knowledge 2. Administrator and teachers attend Mathematics PD- DWT, Evening 3. Computerized skills practice resources recommended by content area specialist for students to help them close their gaps and skill build
Person Responsible	Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

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)

NA

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2081 - Largo High School			\$10,000.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement				\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Proficiency				\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science				\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Social Studies				\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Acceleration				\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: ESE				\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: EL				\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Learning Gains				\$0.00
					Total:	\$10,000.00