

Hernando County School District

# Central High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>11</b>

## Central High School

14075 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/chs>

### School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p><b>2017-18 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">37%</p>

### School Grades History

	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2014-15</b>
<b>Year</b>				
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	C	B*

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

Cultivating integrity, intelligence, and inspiration today to empower students to embrace the challenges of tomorrow"

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

CHS: Cultivating integrity, intelligence, and inspiration today to empower students to embrace the challenges of tomorrow.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Slusser, Kelly	Principal
Owen, Ruth	School Counselor
Merschbach, Jennifer	Other
Murrman, Mildred	Assistant Principal
Kalament, Thomas	Assistant Principal
Clifford, Chris	Assistant Principal
Brooks, Bethann	Teacher, K-12
Guerin, Lisa	Teacher, K-12
Lawyer, Rachel	Teacher, K-12
Merschbach, Brad	Teacher, K-12
Nestor, Joe	Teacher, K-12
Mitchell, Lisa	Teacher, ESE
Carson, Jeff	Teacher, K-12
Maple, Simon	Teacher, K-12
Kingdom, Rachel	Teacher, K-12
Greenwood, Patricia	Teacher, K-12
Abate, Marlene	Teacher, K-12

#### Duties

#### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The school based leadership team works both as a team and departmentally to help drive instruction and practice concepts within their subject area groups to achieve the school improvement goals. The members are leaders in their departments and convey the voices and concerns of their team members. Likewise, they share with their teams information and decisions made by the leadership

team.

The facilitate the SWAP process within their departments and share out data with the SBLT.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

#### 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	63	58	59	298
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	99	100	117	413
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	58	69	47	211
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	68	77	69	304

#### The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161	135	144	136	576

#### 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
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Date this data was collected

Friday 9/28/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	93	91	0	271
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	123	104	83	440
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	90	64	26	285
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	132	52	15	330
	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	44	31	0	134

**Year 2016-17 - 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	80	94	94	59	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	84	103	103	372
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	82	82	69	276
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	152	140	133	563
	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	159	145	100	543

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Math learning gains proved to show a decline in scores. It is not a trend.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Biology showed the greatest decline from the prior year.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Science achievement had the largest gap with a 15% difference between school and state. (52% school 67% for the state)

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math bottom quartile showed the largest gains with a 12% increase. The year before was a 30% increase. This is not a trend.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

CHS implemented intensive math classes as well as MTSS pull-out instruction twice per week.

### 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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	48%	56%	40%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	48%	53%	36%	37%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	39%	44%	24%	26%	38%
Math Achievement	41%	47%	51%	41%	45%	43%
Math Learning Gains	40%	43%	48%	39%	40%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	40%	45%	34%	33%	38%
Science Achievement	52%	58%	67%	66%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	68%	71%	73%	71%	69%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	118 (87)	63 (93)	58 (91)	59 (0)	298 (271)
One or more suspensions	97 (130)	99 (123)	100 (104)	117 (83)	413 (440)
Course failure in ELA or Math	37 (105)	58 (90)	69 (64)	47 (26)	211 (285)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	90 (131)	68 (132)	77 (52)	69 (15)	304 (330)

**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	2018	39%	50%	-11%	53%	-14%
	2017	33%	46%	-13%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	45%	48%	-3%	53%	-8%
	2017	36%	42%	-6%	50%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

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
2018	53%	58%	-5%	65%	-12%
2017	66%	67%	-1%	63%	3%
Compare		-13%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	74%	68%	6%	68%	6%
2017	72%	69%	3%	67%	5%
Compare		2%			



ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	40%	62%	-22%	62%	-22%
2017	42%	59%	-17%	60%	-18%
Compare		-2%			

  

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	37%	45%	-8%	56%	-19%
2017	46%	50%	-4%	53%	-7%
Compare		-9%			

### Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	39	26	27	39	43	25	48		67	14
ELL	17	37	40	23	29	25	41	40			
ASN								75			
BLK	17	34	41	18	28	30	23	57		83	47
HSP	37	51	38	34	37	46	45	58		94	36
MUL	38	29		60	67		64				
WHT	50	51	43	45	41	43	56	81		87	56
FRL	39	48	41	36	38	41	47	68		85	49

  

2017 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	4	14	15	14	34	35	38	50		60	16
ELL	18	39	33	23	26	15	31	58		69	
ASN				80	80						
BLK	18	24	25	22	26	21	62	60		74	25
HSP	21	36	43	36	43	34	50	70		80	42
MUL	59	50		53	50					91	50
WHT	38	41	42	51	42	31	70	76		84	55
FRL	27	37	41	41	37	27	59	68		77	45

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

### Activity #1

**Title** School wide writing in the content areas to synthesize across multiple text sources.

**Rationale** School level scores still fall short of the state. Synthesis is higher order level thinking. Last year, we began school wide writing plans. This showed an improvement that we want to continue. Because writing across the curriculum aids retention, promotes independent thinking, and develops critical thinking skills, we feel this is a worthy goal to support achievement in all areas of the school. When students write and explain their understanding of math, science, social studies, foreign language, and language arts, they retain more of what they have learned.

**Intended Outcome** Students will become more proficient in the areas of reading and writing. This should result in an increase in FSA Language Arts scores. Further, because writing helps students retain learning, they should perform better on their other EOCs as well (math, biology, US History). Increased scores will help increasing the school grade.

**Point Person** Mildred Murrman (murrman\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

### Action Step

**Description** Continue to use the ICEE (Introduce, Cite Evidence, Explain) strategy along with Core Connections training. Continue expanding plan into content areas outside of ELA through PD. Core Connections driven posters will be created and ordered for the classrooms to support the writing structure. Teachers will participate in Core Connections training throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Slusser (slusser\_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Administrative walk-through data will show implementation in the classroom. CHS has developed an app in Googleforms to track the number of instances in which we observe the practices we expect as we complete the walk-through process. This app includes our non-negotiables such as standard and task alignment, writing component, and data. We review the data this app provides on a bi-weekly basis.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Slusser (slusser\_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Activity #2**

**Title** Teachers will facilitate student ownership of formative data.  
**Rationale** If students own their own data, we should see increased proficiency in all subject areas.  
**Intended Outcome** Students will become increasingly aware of their achievement data whether in the classroom or in general based on graduation requirements. This should help increase graduation rate, and assist in increasing the school grade to B.  
**Point Person** Kelly Slusser (slusser\_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Action Step**

**Description** Through PD, assessment teacher will instruct teachers on the use of UNIFY. Then admin will facilitate instruction on formulating plans for teachers/departments to determine how to get students to use data in the classrooms. Teachers will work departmentally to create a student-owned data plan and share the strategy with admin. Students will be signed up for CHALK and have a shortcut on their phones/home screens to their grades.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Slusser (slusser\_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

**Description** Administrative walk-through data will show implementation in the classroom. CHS has developed an app in Googleforms to track the number of instances in which we observe the practices we expect as we complete the walk-through process. This app includes our non-negotiables such as standard and task alignment, writing component, and data. We review the data this app provides on a bi-weekly basis. Additionally, teachers in the SBLT will share their data during data sharing meetings.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Slusser (slusser\_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Part V: Budget**

<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
---------------	---------------