

Hernando County School District

Central High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Central High School

14075 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Slusser

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 87% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| 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 Hernando 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Central High School

14075 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

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

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
| Grade | C | C | C | C |

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 | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Slusser, Kelly | Principal | Develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. Other important duties entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures. |
| Owen, Ruth | School Counselor | AICE Coordinator and Counselor over the Senior Class. Guidance Department Chair. |
| Merschbach, Jennifer | Other | Assessment Teacher. In charge of all district and state testing at CHS. |
| Clifford, Chris | Assistant Principal | Oversees the PE, Fine Arts, CTE, and Science Departments. Assistant Principal over Student Activities. Assistant Principal over the Sophomore class. |
| Brooks, Bethann | Teacher, Career/ Technical | Medical Program Teacher and SGA Sponsor. Also CTE Department Chair |
| Guerin, Lisa | Teacher, K-12 | Math Department Chair |
| Lawyer, Rachel | Teacher, K-12 | English Department Chair |
| Merschbach, Brad | Teacher, K-12 | Social Studies Department Chair |
| Nestor, Joe | Teacher, K-12 | P.E. Department Chair |
| Mitchell, Lisa | Teacher, ESE | ESE Specialist. Peers in Partners In Learning Instructor. ESE Department Co-Chair. |
| Carson, Jeff | Teacher, K-12 | ELA Department Co-Chair. ELA AICE Teacher. |
| Kingdom, Rachel | Teacher, K-12 | Science Department Chair. Science AICE teacher. |
| Greenwood, Patricia | Teacher, K-12 | ESE Department co-chair. |
| Abate, Marlene | Teacher, K-12 | Reading Department Chair |
| Brown, Nathaniel | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal over Junior cohort. Assistant Principal over MTSS/PBS. Assistant Principal overseeing Math, Social Studies, ESOL, World Languages. |

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 | 210 | 53 | 87 | 103 | 453 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 45 | 70 | 91 | 351 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 99 | 123 | 107 | 423 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 36 | 40 | 96 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 106 | 129 | 85 | 406 |

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 | 177 | 133 | 154 | 155 | 619 |

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 | 2 | 2 |
| 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)

71

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

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 | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 | 97 | 99 | 100 | 117 | 413 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 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 | 0 | 90 | 68 | 77 | 69 | 304 |

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 | 161 | 135 | 144 | 136 | 576 |

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 | 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 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 | 161 | 135 | 144 | 136 | 576 |

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 | 41% | 49% | 56% | 35% | 42% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 41% | 45% | 51% | 39% | 43% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 36% | 42% | 40% | 39% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 44% | 51% | 51% | 46% | 49% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | 45% | 48% | 42% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36% | 38% | 45% | 30% | 32% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 62% | 68% | 68% | 66% | 67% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 72% | 71% | 73% | 73% | 69% | 70% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | Total |
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 210 (0) | 53 (0) | 87 (0) | 103 (0) | 453 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 145 (118) | 45 (63) | 70 (58) | 91 (59) | 351 (298) |
| One or more suspensions | 94 (97) | 99 (99) | 123 (100) | 107 (117) | 423 (413) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 (37) | 17 (58) | 36 (69) | 40 (47) | 96 (211) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 86 (90) | 106 (68) | 129 (77) | 85 (69) | 406 (304) |

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 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 55% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 50% | -11% | 53% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 39% | 49% | -10% | 53% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 48% | -3% | 53% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| 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 | 59% | 67% | -8% | 67% | -8% |
| 2018 | 53% | 58% | -5% | 65% | -12% |
| Compare | | 6% | | | |

| 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 | 70% | 70% | 0% | 70% | 0% |
| 2018 | 74% | 68% | 6% | 68% | 6% |
| Compare | | -4% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 39% | 59% | -20% | 61% | -22% |
| 2018 | 40% | 62% | -22% | 62% | -22% |
| Compare | | -1% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 43% | 55% | -12% | 57% | -14% |
| 2018 | 37% | 45% | -8% | 56% | -19% |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 19 | 30 | 22 | 24 | 31 | 23 | 40 | 41 | | 83 | 32 |
| ELL | 16 | 32 | 40 | 13 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 27 | | 93 | 29 |
| ASN | 64 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 33 | 36 | 23 | 34 | 37 | 41 | 38 | | 95 | 40 |
| HSP | 38 | 34 | 39 | 42 | 40 | 34 | 59 | 65 | | 92 | 47 |
| MUL | 22 | 23 | | 45 | 37 | | 70 | 91 | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 47 | 31 | 49 | 50 | 38 | 67 | 76 | | 82 | 56 |
| FRL | 37 | 43 | 32 | 36 | 42 | 36 | 53 | 65 | | 84 | 44 |

| 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 |

| 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 |
| WHT | 38 | 41 | 42 | 51 | 42 | 31 | 70 | 76 | | 84 | 55 |
| FRL | 27 | 37 | 41 | 41 | 37 | 27 | 59 | 68 | | 77 | 45 |

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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 21 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 533 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 33 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 64 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 46 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 48 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 54 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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 ELL and SWD subgroups had the lowest performance; however, the ELL subgroup had the lowest performance in more areas, at 8% below the 41% requirement. ELL student performance decreased in 5 out of the 8 components of the school grade and remained the same in 2 of them. Contributing factors may include reading comprehension, number of years in the U.S., parents not speaking English at home, disengagement, lack of resources, etc.

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

Our FRL subgroup achievement decreased by 20 points from 2018 to 2019. Factors that contributed may include the lack of resources at home, parental involvement, student engagement, and an increase in the FRL student population. The number of students identified as FRL increased by 14% from 2018 to 2019.

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.

Our ELL group has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We are 8% below the 41% requirement. Contributing factors may include reading comprehension, number of years in the U.S., parents not speaking English at home, disengagement, lack of resources, etc.

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

Our Multi Racial subgroup had the greatest improvement with 30 points, however the group is very small and did not have enough students for a graduation rate. The next subgroup with the greatest improvement was our Black subgroup. They showed an increase in graduation rate by 12%. Last year we adopted an alternate schedule to include a Power Hour to assist with students struggling in different areas. Students were encouraged and were assisted with signing up for the SAT and ACT to help with satisfying their graduation assessment requirements.

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

Discipline and the number of level 1's are both two areas of concern. We are working on PBIS to decrease the number of disciplines. The greater the number of disciplines and suspensions, the more class instruction these students are missing. The number of level 1's is a problem that needs to be addressed. We are using the Power Hour and Intensive Math and Reading classes to help address this concern.

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

1. Student Engagement
2. Increase Subgroup Data
3. PBIS, Decrease the number of disciplines
4. Teacher Retention
5. Increase Industry Certifications

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| #1 | |
| Title | Student Engagement |
| Rationale | Data shows approximately 33% of current enrolled students scored a level 1 on at least one statewide assessment in 2018-2019. Data also shows CHS has 3 subgroups below the 41% federal index rate. Data shows 28% had less than 90% attendance in the 2018-2019 school year. Students do not see why their education is important. Students do not fully understand the long term effects of not achieving a high school diploma. This leads to non-motivated learners and teacher apathy. |

| | |
|---|---|
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains by 5% |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kelly Slusser (slusser_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | 1. Maintain our PBIS school-wide program. 2. Administrative Walkthroughs with a focus on Student Engagement. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | 1. Create a positive culture and climate to promote student learning. 2. Teacher Accountability to promote student engagement in the classroom. |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan the PBIS curriculum for half days of school. 2. Create CHS APP to progress monitor student engagement and PBIS in the classrooms. 3. Assess Professional Development needs around Student Engagement and PBIS from our staff. 4. Celebrate teachers with great student engagement lessons. 5. Progress Monitor Student Achievement Data and Attendance Data. |
| Person Responsible | Kelly Slusser (slusser_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |

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).