Cypress Creek High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Creek High School

8701 OLD PASCO RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33544

https://cchs.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Carin Hetzler Nettles

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2020

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)	36%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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 Pasco 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

Cypress Creek High School

8701 OLD PASCO RD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33544

https://cchs.pasco.k12.fl.us

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	35%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

H-Have a growth mindset
O-Own your education
W-Work as a community
L-Lead responsibly

Provide the school's vision statement.

All of our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

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
Hetzler-Nettles, Carin	Principal	Responsible for ensuring a quality education for every student by coaching school leadership teams. This includes developing the knowledge, skills and abilities in these teams throughout the district to effectively implement district priorities; providing differentiated support to specific school leaders; and monitoring efforts to ensure implementation that will lead to student success. Also responsible for working closely with the Assistant Superintendent for Student Achievement and Learning Community Executive Directors to facilitate support between the central offices and schools focused on academic achievement and equitable practices for all.
Ferry, jena	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
Gricoski, Donna	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
Hawk, Robin	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
Herzek, Jessica	Teacher, Career/Technical	Middle and High School CTE PLC Facilitator
Hoch, Justine	Teacher, K-12	Middle and High School World Languages PLC Facilitator
Hoffman, John	Teacher, K-12	Middle and High School PE PLC Facilitator
Lloyd, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	High School Social Studies PLC Facilitator
Manning, Ariel	Instructional Coach	Middle and High School Learning Design Coach
Hamilton, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	High School Math PLC Facilitator
Uchacz, Dan	Teacher, K-12	High School Science PLC Facilitator
Copeland, Rusty	Assistant Principal	Perform responsibilities assigned by principal.
Pellicia, Carlye	Teacher, K-12	ELA PLC facilitator
Enyart, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	Fine Arts PLC facilitator
Kwiat, Karie	Teacher, ESE	ESE PLC Facilitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/6/2020, Carin Hetzler Nettles

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.*

1

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

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)	36%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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.

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	467	394	350	315	1526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	20	23	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	25	21	96
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	84	76	52	259
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	77	99	72	334

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	31	55	63	45	194

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/14/2020

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	290	326	316	342	312	194	225	2005
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	13	17	14	22	26	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	23	38	23	27	10	8	165
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	24	39	57	43	40	0	242
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	85	76	101	75	37	5	433

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	37	28	39	50	43	29	2	228

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	290	326	316	342	312	194	225	2005
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	13	17	14	22	26	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	23	38	23	27	10	8	165
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	24	39	57	43	40	0	242
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	85	76	101	75	37	5	433

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	37	28	39	50	43	29	2	228

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	57%	57%	56%	0%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	53%	51%	0%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	41%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	66%	56%	51%	0%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	58%	49%	48%	0%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	42%	45%	0%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	70%	68%	0%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	73%	73%	0%	68%	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	54%	57%	-3%	55%	-1%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	53%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

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	76%	68%	8%	67%	9%
2018	72%	65%	7%	65%	7%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	70%	9%	71%	8%
2018	76%	71%	5%	71%	5%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	69%	1%	70%	0%
2018	72%	70%	2%	68%	4%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	60%	-3%	61%	-4%
2018	66%	63%	3%	62%	4%
Compare		-9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	62%	13%	57%	18%
2018	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
Compare		7%			

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	17	35	33	28	35	28	27	42	23		
ELL	29	47	49	43	55	47	29	57			
ASN	78	67		91	77		92	95			

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
BLK	48	46	46	53	56	50	51	74	56		
HSP	52	50	42	62	55	41	59	72	47		
MUL	59	56	36	63	61		75	75			
WHT	60	52	43	69	59	43	72	78	58		
FRL	43	44	40	53	52	36	51	66	52		

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	22	40	39	22	40	40	22	49			
ELL	20	46	50	33	59	50	8	53			
ASN	76	59		88	67			100			
BLK	51	48	52	55	42	42	58	67	53		
HSP	52	52	44	52	49	36	56	72	59		
MUL	57	38	18	70	48	58	62	86			
WHT	64	54	41	67	58	52	65	78	57		
FRL	47	46	36	50	50	42	50	66	51		

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

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	47
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	83
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	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
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	50
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.

ELA Grade 9 scores showed a decline from the previous year. A major contributing factor that led to the decline was the retention and development of the teachers.

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

ELA Grade 9 scores showed the greatest decline from the previous year. A major contributing factor that led to the decline was the retention and development of the teachers.

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.

Algebra Grade 9 scores showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. A major contributing factor that led to the decline was the retention and development of the teachers.

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

The geometry EOC in the 2019 school year showed the most improvement over the prior year's performance. This group of subject area teachers worked in collaborative PLCs to improve their test scores.

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

The number of students scoring Level 1 on statewide ELA & Math assessments provides the greatest concern for the school.

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

1. Increase students passing the 9th Grade Algebra EOC.
2. Reduce course failures in mathematics.
3. Increase students passing the 10th Grade FSA.
4. Reduce course failures in ELA.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area focus of leadership, specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and retention, impacts student learning by developing highly effective instructors in the classroom. By focusing on the retention of our Algebra teachers, we hope to raise our 9th-grade Algebra scores which are, currently, lower than the district and state.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2020 school year, CCHS will raise Algebra 1 scores to 60% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donna Gricoski (dgricosk@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize the teach-assess cycle to address student needs. Working as a collaborative PLC, the algebra teachers will identify standards to cover, develop engaging lessons to cover the standards, create common formative assessments (CFA) to gauge student understanding, and re-teach or enrich based on CFA results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By analyzing what students are proving they know or don't know through the CFA, teachers can ensure they are providing ample time and support for each student.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will analyze the newest testing data for their students and assess their needs.

Person Responsible Donna Gricoski (dgricosk@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will create common formative assessments based on the standards and curriculum of the Algebra course. Once taken, teachers will analyze the data to determine what students need to be retaught and who needs to be enriched.

Person Responsible Donna Gricoski (dgricosk@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will attend district-offered PD.

Person Responsible Donna Gricoski (dgricosk@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

High Impact Instruction: By the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year, at least 95% of instructional staff will demonstrate evidence that they are planning, delivering, assessing, and monitoring standards-based instruction match to the rigor of the standard.
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Identify essential standards/learning for each grade level or course.
Create essential standards/learning unit plans.
Implement the teaching-assessing cycle.
Give common end-of-unit assessments for essential standards.
Utilize the intervention period with Coyote Core for tier 2 and 3 supports.
Utilize blended learning to increase continuity in and out of the classroom.

Collaborative Culture: By the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year, CCHS staff members will collaborate to increase Student Hope and Engagement.
Students will set learning/behavior goals and monitor progress through milestones.
Students will meet as a grade level each quarter to celebrate success.
Grade Level Teams will identify, support, and monitor the lowest 35% of students. (SSAP)
SBIT Team will identify, support, and monitor tier 3 students services
PLCs will use grade level data to plan for instruction.
By the end of the school year all staff and students will utilize social and emotional learning resources.
LDC will lead Pineapple Teach Weeks and model class setup to increase staff collaboration and sharing of Best Practices.

Data Driven Decisions: By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, CCHS will implement tiered supports for academics and behavior for all grade levels.
Academic
Use data from CFAs to identify students for Tier 2 support by student, standard/learning and learning target.
Utilize Coyote Core intervention to prioritize students in need of Tier 2 and 3 supports.
Monitor EOS data of underrepresented subgroups and increase efforts to reduce barriers to advanced coursework.
Behavior
Monitor disaggregated referral data quarterly.
Monitor the use of Coyote Cash and purchases within the Pack Shack.
Monitor referrals versus Students of the Week.

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.

CCHS utilizes a weekly newsletter entitled, The Howler Hub. This weekly form of communication with all stakeholders connects the reader to ways to actively engage in PBIS efforts. Here, parents, teachers, and students can nominate others for staff and students of the week. In addition, the newsletter communicates initiatives led by the School Leadership team, updates on the latest data, and news for the school. CCHS also has an active School Advisory Council that plays a critical role in the development and implementation of actions needed to reach the goals as outlined by the School Improvement Plan. Every month, the career resource committee holds meetings to assist parents and community members with various ways to support their students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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