

Collier County Public Schools

Palmetto Ridge 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Palmetto Ridge High School

1655 VICTORY LN, Naples, FL 34120

<https://www.collierschools.com/prh>

Demographics

Principal: Tobin Walcott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

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)	77%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Collier 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Palmetto Ridge High School

1655 VICTORY LN, Naples, FL 34120

<https://www.collierschools.com/prh>

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	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

Our mission is student development. We will graduate all students on time by releasing their intellectual capacity, affirming their right to learn, and cultivating citizens of honorable character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will be an organization dedicated to producing successive generations of citizens prepared to constructively participate in the society of their time.

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
Ragusa, James	Principal	The role of the principal is to provide the leadership and facilitate the SIP structures. The principal ensures that professional development is available to staff in these areas, regularly attends meetings to support these processes, as well as identifies the needs of the team, communicates with school stakeholders, regarding the SIP and addresses each core concern. The principal serves as the instructional leader and makes informed decisions, with the leadership team, that will ultimately improve student achievement.
Chouinard, Daniel	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.
Durik, Michal	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.
Costello, Lanajean	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.
Williams, Belynda	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Tobin Walcott

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.*

2

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

103

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)	77%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	539	549	567	489	2144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	23	46	34	151
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	76	74	41	270
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	50	83	84	251
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	70	85	86	301
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	105	118	60	392
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	70	85	86	301

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	78	77	100	70	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	34	6	40	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/18/2020

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	542	523	538	471	2074	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	29	44	35	148	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	82	87	54	336	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	112	183	107	508	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	135	113	63	443	

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	0	0	0	

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	11	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

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	0	542	523	538	471	2074
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	29	44	35	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	82	87	54	336
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	112	183	107	508
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	135	113	63	443

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	11	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

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	56%	59%	56%	61%	58%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	52%	51%	52%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	41%	42%	38%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	58%	58%	51%	63%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	54%	44%	48%	49%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	46%	45%	43%	43%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	72%	68%	74%	69%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	76%	73%	69%	71%	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%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	75%	68%	7%	67%	8%
2018	90%	72%	18%	65%	25%
Compare		-15%			
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%	72%	-4%	70%	-2%
2018	74%	72%	2%	68%	6%
Compare		-6%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	67%	-25%	61%	-19%
2018	45%	67%	-22%	62%	-17%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	59%	5%	57%	7%
2018	70%	67%	3%	56%	14%
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	23	39	35	28	51	48	46	47		94	40
ELL	29	46	35	33	48	28	46	35		88	55
AMI	45	55		30			80			100	88
BLK	55	44	25	45	49	50	64	62		100	59
HSP	53	49	42	57	54	54	73	70		97	64
MUL	64	50		53	60		77	86		100	91
WHT	60	53	46	65	54	62	79	72		97	70
FRL	48	42	36	52	53	50	69	63		96	61
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	31	48	39	42	46	31	76	40		95	28
ELL	17	42	36	38	29	38		25		69	73
AMI	24	41		35	42			82			
ASN										100	58
BLK	62	59	43	57	54	50	91	59		95	60
HSP	59	56	42	59	54	52	90	70		93	71
MUL	70	52		66	60		100	80			
WHT	68	60	43	73	62	48	90	80		97	67
FRL	55	55	41	57	53	49	91	66		93	61

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	21	34	31	35	42	31	51	42		83	19
ELL	16	26	21	43	47	40	24	16		76	53
AMI	40	55		30	31			75		100	50
BLK	56	45	43	64	53	38	70	50		93	43
HSP	60	50	38	61	49	48	73	64		92	49
MUL	52	55		62	41						
WHT	65	55	34	67	49	41	79	76		93	62
FRL	53	48	38	58	47	40	70	63		89	46

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	669
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	66
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	60
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	73
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	66
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	56
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.

9th grade English Language Arts (ELA) learning gains showed a drop of 8% from 2018. According to the data, subskill-1, key ideas & details, is the lowest tested area. In addition, the ELL students showed a gap of 20% in the same tested area subskill-1. Read 180 was newly implemented in SY 18-19 scores historically dropped when a new program is implemented. This is partly due to staffing in the 9th grade ELA team. The team has been modified to strategically place ELA teachers with stronger background in reading instruction.

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

The greatest decline was in the proficiency level of Biology. Our level went from a 90% in 2018 to a 75% in 2019. This cause can be attributed to two main factors: First, the introduction of Integrated Science students into the testing group, and a newly hired instructor was a factor.

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.

US History had the greatest gap falling below the state average by 3%. Over the last 5 years, the school data indicated that we were on par with the state. There are no trends indicated in the data. The teacher of record left the school.

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

The most improvement seen was in the lowest 25% in Math. There was an increased focus on differentiated instruction and daily monitoring in Math for those teachers who taught the lowest 25%. Additionally, classes were leveled to target student needs.

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

One area of concern is attendance, particularly for 9th grade students. We plan to address student attendance through the use of Connection Coaches, monitoring weekly attendance and following up with the students and their caregivers, and early student conferencing. Teachers meet bi-weekly in Professional Learning Communities. The first meeting of the month teachers discuss curriculum concerns including student grades and the second meeting of the month a Attendance and Discipline Assistant Principal attends the meeting to discuss absences and behavior concerns. If a student's non-attendance increases, then attendance contracts will be developed by the Attendance and Discipline Office.

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

1. Increase ELA achievement in the lowest quartile.
2. Increase the percentage by at least 2% in the FSA subskill-1, Key Ideas and Details
3. Decrease the percentage of students with attendance below 90%.
4. Increase proficiency level in Biology.
5. US History teacher assigned with ESE teaching experience paired with an ESE inclusion teacher.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase gains in ELA achievement in the lowest quartile.
 Decrease the number of students in the FSA subskill-1, key ideas and details.
 Decrease the achievement gap between Non-ELL and ELL students.
 The data shows Palmetto Ridge High has a 42% achievement gap between Non-ELL and ELL students in comparison to the District's 34% and the State's 29%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase gains in 9th grade ELA from 54% to 57% and in 10th grade ELA from 55% to 58%.
 Baseline data will be administered by ELA teachers by using Systems-44, Read 180, common grade level assessment, and District provided baseline for ELA.
 Based on the assessments--Baseline, common grade level assessments, QBA, FSA--students will show growth throughout the 2020-21 school year in Key Ideas and Details.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Ragusa (ragusaja@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: We plan on increasing the utilization and implementation along with instructional fidelity of READ 180. Our administrative team will utilize PLC's to ensure ELA instructional staff are aware of curricular goals and have the necessary time and tools needed to expand upon growing ELA needs and gaps in student learning. Prior years data revealed our ELA scores to be 4% points below district average and 2% points below state average.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Criteria used to make this determination included prior years Needs Assessment results. Among the resources to be utilized for the strategy are greater incorporation of our Reading Coach in our ELA courses.

Action Steps to Implement

Student scheduling based on literacy levels.

Person Responsible Daniel Chouinard (choudid@collierschools.com)

Identify students in the lowest quartile.

Person Responsible James Ragusa (ragusaja@collierschools.com)

Data driven PLC instructional work and collaborative planning within the ELA department.

Person Responsible Lanajean Costello (costel@collierschools.com)

Integration of Reading Coach in ELA courses to support data driven standards based instruction and effective strategies that addresses area of focus on FSA subskills.

Person Responsible Belynda Williams (williabe@collierschools.com)

Cross-curricular literacy integration with with content subject areas.

Person Responsible James Ragusa (ragusaja@collierschools.com)

Instructional focus on differentiated instructions for individualized student sub-groups based on FSA ELA subskills.

Person Responsible James Ragusa (ragusaja@collierschools.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students who fall below 90% attendance. Students with excessive absences perform at lower levels of proficiency than their peers due to the loss of instructional time. Provide academic supports

Measurable Outcome: We will be working towards decreasing the percentage of students with less than 90% attendance by 10%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lanajean Costello (costel@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students results on the Panorama survey indicated 75% of students lack an adult connection on campus. We plan on incorporating Connection Coaches in an effort to increase student sense of belonging as indicated in our Panorama student survey results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Weekly student reports will indicate progression and will highlight students of concern. Increased communication with parents, teachers, guidance counselors, licensed mental health professional and connection coaches will help identify and address at risk students.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students with 10% absences in the prior school year.

Person Responsible Lanajean Costello (costel@collierschools.com)

Identify staff members to serve as Connection Coaches

Person Responsible Lanajean Costello (costel@collierschools.com)

Collaborate with Connection Coaches to establish guidelines for positive/attendance student interactions.

Person Responsible Lanajean Costello (costel@collierschools.com)

Assign students based on course schedule.

Person Responsible Lanajean Costello (costel@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Weekly administration meetings to identify at-risk students, as well as bi-weekly PLCs to identify student concerns. Administration will hold meetings with individual students to discuss concerns. In addition, the administration will communicate with all stakeholders: parents, guidance counselors, connection coaches, reading coach, licensed mental health professional, behavior specialist, ESE program specialists, ESE school intervention therapist, and teachers, in an effort to decrease student absences.

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.

The culture of the school is one of support for our students, teachers, and families. With the Social Emotional Learning will continue to support not only self-care, but foster safety and belonging to the school community, therefore supporting the school motto - "one school, one family".

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00