

Hendry County Schools

Clewiston High School



2020-21 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 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Clewiston High School

1501 S FRANCISCO ST, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=4&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Phillip Summers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| 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 Hendry 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 |

Clewiston High School

1501 S FRANCISCO ST, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=4&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 87% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | C | C |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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.

Clewiston High will ensure that all students make academic gains in a safe environment that encourages students to take on academic challenges with support in pursuit of them becoming well-rounded and productive citizens of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage, Inspire, and Challenge, every student, every day.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|-----------|---|
| Sanchez, Roberto | Principal | Phillip Summers - Assistant Principal (summersp@hendry-schools.net) |
| | | Reko Parantha - Dean (paranthar@hendry-schools.net) |
| | | Tori Roberts - Dean (robertst@hendry-schools.net) |
| | | Jose Roquett - Administrator (roquettj@hendry-schools.net) |
| | | Sherrie Llossas - Counselor (llossass@hendry-schools.net) |
| | | Ian Stone - Counselor (stonei@hendry-schools.net) Technology Lead |
| | | Veronica Roquett - Teacher (roquettv@hendry-schools.net) AP Lead |
| | | Leslie Harn - Teacher (harnl@hendry-schools.net) *Science lead |
| | | Carmelo Rindone - Teacher (rindonec@hendry-schools.net) *Social Studies lead |
| | | Stephanie Robertson - AVID Coordinator/ESE Lead (robertsons@hendry-schools.net) |
| | | Lauren Kinard- Teacher (kinardl@hendry-schools.net) *ELA lead |
| | | Reina Margarito-Teacher (margaritor@hendry-schools.net) *Math lead |
| | | Tammy Harn- Teacher (harnt@hendry-schools.net) Enrichment Lead |
| | | Jennie Goffe-Teacher (goffej@hendry-schools.net) CTE Lead |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Phillip Summers

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| 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 . | |

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 | 263 | 240 | 232 | 255 | 990 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 68 | 68 | 66 | 276 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 34 | 46 | 36 | 160 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 22 | 10 | 35 | 92 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 64 | 71 | 84 | 324 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 65 | 65 | 57 | 276 |

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 | 98 | 70 | 76 | 81 | 325 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 12 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 10/11/2020

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 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 225 | 241 | 211 | 940 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 37 | 38 | 51 | 159 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 26 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 41 | 53 | 56 | 193 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 90 | 99 | 83 | 377 | |

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 | 47 | 41 | 60 | 56 | 204 | |

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 | |

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 225 | 241 | 211 | 940 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 37 | 38 | 51 | 159 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 26 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 41 | 53 | 56 | 193 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 90 | 99 | 83 | 377 |

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 | 47 | 41 | 60 | 56 | 204 |

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 | |

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 | 42% | 43% | 56% | 34% | 35% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 45% | 47% | 51% | 33% | 39% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 35% | 42% | 26% | 27% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 27% | 32% | 51% | 35% | 39% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 37% | 49% | 48% | 54% | 53% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 47% | 45% | 55% | 53% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 57% | 72% | 68% | 44% | 45% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 71% | 66% | 73% | 56% | 56% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09 | 2019 | 42% | 44% | -2% | 55% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 40% | 0% | 53% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 37% | 38% | -1% | 53% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 40% | -4% | 53% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 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 | 54% | 65% | -11% | 67% | -13% |
| 2018 | 83% | 59% | 24% | 65% | 18% |
| Compare | | -29% | | | |
| 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 | 68% | 62% | 6% | 70% | -2% |
| 2018 | 59% | 55% | 4% | 68% | -9% |
| Compare | | 9% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 27% | 38% | -11% | 61% | -34% |
| 2018 | 24% | 41% | -17% | 62% | -38% |
| Compare | | 3% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 23% | 40% | -17% | 57% | -34% |
| 2018 | 22% | 42% | -20% | 56% | -34% |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 18 | 37 | 22 | 22 | 50 | | 36 | 39 | | 84 | 19 |
| ELL | 23 | 30 | 28 | 32 | 50 | | 50 | 64 | | 33 | |
| BLK | 34 | 39 | 26 | 17 | 34 | 25 | 41 | 60 | | 82 | 39 |
| HSP | 40 | 44 | 36 | 27 | 33 | 26 | 63 | 72 | | 76 | 59 |
| WHT | 57 | 55 | 36 | 41 | 59 | | 63 | 81 | | 94 | 63 |
| FRL | 39 | 43 | 34 | 28 | 36 | 33 | 53 | 70 | | 78 | 48 |
| 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 | 14 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 30 | | 64 | 45 | | 88 | 13 |
| ELL | 22 | 23 | 10 | 41 | 55 | | | | | 39 | |
| BLK | 30 | 39 | 47 | 15 | 25 | | 70 | 47 | | 96 | 11 |
| HSP | 39 | 40 | 31 | 31 | 44 | 64 | 85 | 68 | | 81 | 61 |
| WHT | 53 | 45 | | 31 | 42 | | 97 | 64 | | 94 | 59 |
| FRL | 37 | 41 | 37 | 25 | 39 | 55 | 83 | 60 | | 87 | 43 |
| 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 | 10 | 23 | 15 | 19 | 36 | | 12 | 25 | | 57 | 6 |
| ELL | 21 | 19 | 15 | 21 | | | | | | 25 | |
| BLK | 25 | 24 | 16 | 17 | 37 | 53 | 29 | 47 | | 78 | 28 |

| 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 |
| HSP | 36 | 35 | 26 | 35 | 55 | 46 | 41 | 54 | | 70 | 59 |
| WHT | 44 | 38 | 47 | 55 | 72 | 100 | 68 | 72 | | 80 | 63 |
| FRL | 29 | 33 | 26 | 30 | 52 | 57 | 39 | 53 | | 70 | 51 |

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 | 49 |
| 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 | 64 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 540 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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.

Our overall math performance showed the lowest performance. We attribute the lack of performance to several factors. We had a change in personnel where we moved the previous year's math coach to an administrative role. We struggled to find quality assessments that could accurately measure student learning in Algebra and Geometry. We did not have a strong enough system where we could conduct progress monitoring at an appropriate level and at a consistent level year round.

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 was our biology scores . We attribute this to developing greater access to a course like biology to younger students and in addition, not providing enough instructional support to our science teachers. We need a stronger more robust progress monitoring system in biology and we need to give greater access to 9th graders to Foundations of Agriscience which is a course that aligns to the Biology EOC by 70%.

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.

The greatest gap for our school came in the math achievement level. Our performance was 24 points below the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap lie in the insufficient progress monitoring assessment tools and resources last year. Also, a lack of a math coach that could have provided direct support was also a contributing factor to the poor performance.

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

Our overall social studies achievement score improved by eight points in 2019 from 2018. Our school had a clear curriculum map for this subject and the teachers both did an excellent job in teaching the standards. We also had a strong progress monitoring system in place. Both teachers also held an extensive amount of study and review sessions both after school and on certain Saturdays. We will and must continue to give students extended learning opportunities in US History.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Graduation rate among ELL students
African American students proficient in ELA.

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

1. 1. Continue to improve school-wide culture.
2. Improve proficiency in math (geometry and algebra).
3. Improve school use of data and improvement adjustments in core tested subjects.
4. Formative assessment systems.
5. Implement an increased amount of AVID instructional strategies in all classrooms.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | We need to address making instructional shifts in math based on progress monitoring data. In the area of math (algebra and geometry) we need to develop lessons that will drive student learning based on data. Our math scores for 2019 were low and need to be improved. |
| Measurable Outcome: | We would like to our school increase our math point component of our school grade by at least 30 points in 2021 compared to 2019. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Data based decision making has long been proven to help schools make good decisions that will impact student learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | After analyzing the factors that contributed to our low performance in math in 2019, we determined that the weak progress monitoring system was the most important item to enhance this school year. |

Action Steps to Implement

Identify a strong system for progress monitoring in geometry and algebra.

Person Responsible Roberto Sanchez (sanchezr@hendry-schools.net)

Ensure teachers in math collect the data related to their progress monitoring assessments and report it during the Tiger Eye data review process.

Person Responsible Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Progress Monitoring in State Assessed Areas

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Analyzing data on a regular basis in order to modify instruction has been proven to raise student performance. We will review the data in all state assessed areas (ELA in 9th/10th grade, algebra, geometry, biology, US History, CTE and AP exam pass rates) on a monthly basis as part of our leadership team meetings.

Measurable Outcome: Ensure that we meet 45% of all students making proficiency in reading and making learning gains in ELA and that all other areas that are state assessed increase by at least 5% points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Roberto Sanchez (sanchezr@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research proves that the more effective job a school does to identify their data and make instructional decisions based on the data analysis, the school retains the ability to move forward academically.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure that all students in 9th grade and 10th grade have access to rigorous grade appropriate curriculum and instruction in their ELA/reading and math course.
2. Conduct progress monitoring and benchmark assessments after instruction in state assessed subjects.
3. Analyze data and modify instruction based on the results of the data analysis.
4. Use results to modify instruction in ELA and math courses.
5. Monitor via formative assessments and benchmark assessments if modifications had an impact.

Person Responsible Roberto Sanchez (sanchezr@hendry-schools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Culture energizes the work that must be done in order for our school to continue to improve. As such, administration will continue to work on the development of a strong, student focused, positive school culture where both teachers and students enjoy working and learning.

Measurable Outcome: Improve student attendance to above 90%.
Decrease discipline referrals by at least 10% in each grade level from 2019 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Roberto Sanchez (sanchezr@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Lead Now Model by Tim Kight.
Provide feedback to staff and students within a strong system of accountability.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order for our staff and our students to perform and work effectively, we must have a positive encouraging school culture. There is a mountain of research that indicates that when organizations or schools have a strong team-oriented school culture, it allows teachers to have an increased amount of learning take place in their room. This culture both supports and encourages the instructional work that must take place to raise student achievement. This leads to the creation of a place/environment where both students and staff feel connected and happy, thereby making it more likely students will come to school more often and not engage in negative behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Share the Lead Now model with admin and leadership team.
2. Create a plan with specific ways that our administration will thank and observe our staff and students and give positive feedback, and develop a strong trusting relationship with our staff and students.
3. Empower more staff and students to take on a leadership roles and have a positive affect on our school.
4. Establish and communicate core values and align all the work we do to the core values and vision of the organization.

Person Responsible Roberto Sanchez (sanchezr@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

School administration will conduct more classroom walkthroughs specifically looking for items listed in our school improvement priorities to ensure teachers are making progress in closing achievement gaps and teaching to a high level of rigor. Much of the room for growth that our school has is related to looking at data and creating more opportunities for our staff and administrators to collaborate more and engage in discussions related to best instructional practices that will improve the probability of students learning better, especially in state assessed areas./subjects.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Clewiston High School addresses building a positive culture and environment by focusing on investing in people/ building relationships, having a shared vision, setting the tone and praising and celebrating both students and teachers.

Clewiston High School believes relationships are the most important part of establishing a school culture that is perceived as and breeds caring. When people feel valued, staff and students, they are more likely to work harder, stay focused on the journey, and enjoy coming to school. It's the goal of all staff in a school to foster and forward positive relationships with students and among peers. Our school culture doesn't exist because of a program. It exists because of the people within the building. That includes aides, secretary, teachers, administrators, and most importantly students.

Creating and sustaining a positive school culture is having a consistent, shared vision for your school. Our staff and students feel that they are being treated the same as everyone else, regardless of their differences. School leaders has done a good job generating school and classroom rules and expectations. Administrative leaders will follow through consistently with discipline and consequences creating a sense of trust and support; staff feels as though they are supported to do their jobs well, and trust among all school constituents that the rules are followed and enforced consistently.

Clewiston High School administrators do a good job modeling how to be role models. We show students how to be kind, caring, and that we value them. As is best practice in instruction, modeling is key to understanding with anything in school buildings. So, it is important to model these behaviors.

At CHS we praise appropriately and celebrate victories; large and small. We understand recognition is one way in which people feel valued. Our administrators have given teachers hand written notes, "Zingers", teacher of the month, made trips to their houses to hand deliver a goodie bag. We recognize two students of the month, which is voted on by teachers. We have a thriving PBIS program, which focus and acknowledges positive, infectious behaviors. During walk thrus admin acknowledge and reward entire classrooms where students are in compliance with doing the "little" thing correctly. The foundation is set for students to learn and achieve their best when they feel safe, supported, respected, and valued in their environment,

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.