Chiefland Middle High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chiefland Middle High School

808 N MAIN ST, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Mclelland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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

Chiefland Middle High School

808 N MAIN ST, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

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 6-12	Yes	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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.

We, the faculty of Chiefland Middle High School, believe our purpose is to challenge and prepare students to become productive, responsible citizens. We will encourage students within a caring and challenging community to set achievable goals and strive to reach these goals through personal excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

CMHS students will achieve personal success in their learning and become responsible and productive citizens.

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
Mclelland, Matthew	Principal	- School Leader - Facilitates PST's - Gathers Schoolwide Data
Crawford, Michelle	Instructional Coach	- High School Reading Coach - Gathers Grades 9-12 data - Assists Teachers with reading support
Flemming, Jan	Teacher, K-12	- Instructional Facilitator for ELA
Parks, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	- Instructional Facilitator for math
Perez, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	- Instructional Facilitator for history
Ebert, Robert	Assistant Principal	- School Leader - Facilitates PST's - Gathers Schoolwide Data
Corbin, Katie	Instructional Coach	- Instructional Coach - Graduation Coach - Gathers Grades 9-12 data
Edison, Teri	School Counselor	- Middle School Counselor - Provides counseling services to students - Gathers attendance, grade and mental health data
Drummond, Stacy	School Counselor	- High School School Counselor - Provides counseling services to students - Gathers attendance, grade and mental health data
Frields, Amy	Teacher, K-12	- Instructional Facilitator for science
Allen, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	- School Leader - Facilitates PST's - Gathers Schoolwide Data

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/13/2006, Matthew Mclelland

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.*

5

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	104	108	135	132	120	118	72	789
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	5	10	15	13	18	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	31	34	41	39	22	30	218
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	3	4	9	5	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	24	16	18	21	13	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	24	29	20	15	22	143
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	26	13	13	11	23	16	132

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	60	60	76	79	91	66	70	502

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	1	7	0	0	12	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	7	1	7	0	34

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/28/2020

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	115	120	114	120	109	113	104	795
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	16	15	20	9	28	16	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	20	12	8	11	8	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4	3	12	14	14	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	27	25	24	30	38	13	182

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	90	92	90	101	87	98	89	647

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	8	3	11	4	0	20	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	4	0	9	0	21

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	115	120	114	120	109	113	104	795
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	16	15	20	9	28	16	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	20	12	8	11	8	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4	3	12	14	14	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	27	25	24	30	38	13	182

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	90	92	90	101	87	98	89	647

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	8	3	11	4	0	20	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	4	0	9	0	21

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	47%	0%	56%	42%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	0%	51%	48%	0%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	0%	42%	36%	0%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	0%	51%	52%	0%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	0%	48%	54%	0%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	0%	45%	45%	0%	39%
Science Achievement	54%	0%	68%	58%	0%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	0%	73%	80%	0%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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**
06	2019	40%	41%	-1%	54%	-14%
	2018	46%	35%	11%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	37%	14%	52%	-1%
	2018	54%	41%	13%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	43%	36%	7%	56%	-13%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
09	2019	51%	50%	1%	55%	-4%
	2018	37%	40%	-3%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
10	2019	46%	50%	-4%	53%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	38%	-1%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	45%	14%	55%	4%
	2018	61%	41%	20%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	68%	55%	13%	54%	14%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	54%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	29%	29%	0%	46%	-17%
	2018	61%	38%	23%	45%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-32%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	43%	43%	0%	48%	-5%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	66%	-6%	67%	-7%
2018	54%	58%	-4%	65%	-11%
Compare	6%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	72%	10%	71%	11%
2018	84%	73%	11%	71%	13%
Compare	-2%				

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	68%	-3%	70%	-5%
2018	71%	66%	5%	68%	3%
Compare		-6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	57%	2%	61%	-2%
2018	52%	44%	8%	62%	-10%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	53%	-12%	57%	-16%
2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Compare		-9%			

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	44	48	29	41	36	29	42		91	60
ELL	60	36		60	70						
BLK	20	27	35	27	34	43	24	43			
HSP	60	41		67	58	36	79	55	73		
MUL	18	12		39	31						
WHT	51	51	39	58	53	48	57	79	68	95	76
FRL	42	43	41	53	50	40	49	62	68	88	73
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	17	24	16	24	43	31	19	37		89	41
BLK	20	33	38	27	41	36	25	67		86	50
HSP	62	52		66	73		61	88	36		
MUL	44	47		45	53						
WHT	51	50	34	65	68	54	52	79	44	91	75
FRL	42	45	36	55	62	48	44	74	27	87	62
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	2	26	33	17	40	34	13	48		93	50
ELL		50		10	42						

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
BLK	19	35	26	37	50	46	20	71		100	10
HSP	37	55	46	43	56	50	36	64			
MUL	33	38		53	60		45				
WHT	47	50	38	55	55	45	67	82	38	94	80
FRL	34	43	32	47	53	46	49	76	29	92	63

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	59
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	648
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	57
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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	59
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	25
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	55
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.

Based on the data provided, overall, the lowest performance is in ELA with 47% achievement. ELA learning gains dropped one percentage point. ELA has been the lowest performing component historically. More specifically, the incoming 6th graders typically have low achievement and low growth in 5th grade, but stay at low achievement and move to higher growth in 6th grade. Current progress monitoring data measures 40% of incoming 6th graders are at risk and 55% of 7th graders are at risk. Factors contributing to the low performance include inconsistent attendance, new ELA teachers, an gaps in depth of knowledge of the ELA standards.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year, from 64% to 51%.Performance is lowest on the 8th grade math FSA due to higher achieving students enrolling in Algebra. New math teachers, and no space in the master schedule for additional intensive math remediation. Scaffolding learning takes more time due to gaps of math basics.

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.

Science achievement is the component with the greatest gap compared to the state. An issue with teacher turnover in this subject area is a likely contributor to this gap. Science concepts are grouped by grade level and while the content of a single concept is covered thoroughly in a year, these concepts are not revisited until 8th grade when an entirely new concept is being taught. There's a span of several years between Life Science basics in 7th grade and Biology in 10th grade.

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

While Social Studies is the highest achieving, this component improved by 6 percentage points.Middle school acceleration had the most growth, an increase of 32 points. The social studies teachers are seasoned and are very familiar with their standards and content. Critical reading is emphasized to comprehend informational text. The bump in MS acceleration is a result of increasing the opportunity for students in 8th grade to take Algebra I. Blended learning was also emphasized using rigorous coursework and Algebra Nation.

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

In nearly all grade levels, almost a quarter of the grade level scored a level 1. There is a high percentage of students with 2 or more early warning indicators in each grade level.

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

1. ELA lowest quartile
2. Black/multiracial achievement (ESSA subgroups)
3.
4
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is on instructional practice relating to ELA with regard to achievement and improvement in the lowest quartile. As a result of implementing evidence-based practices targeting instructional practice relating to ELA, students will grow as readers to comprehend text proficiently. Regardless of a student's path after high school, reading is fundamental. The rationale for choosing this focus lies in improvement being the greatest benefit to all students, and it is the weakest core area based on the data.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement for the lowest quartile will increase from 39% to 50% as measured by the ELA FSA for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Mclelland (matthew.mclelland@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction is the evidence-based strategy Chiefland Middle High School will be implementing, published by Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., and Torgesen, J. (2008). Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A Practice Guide (NCEE #2008-4027). The strategy includes summarizing, asking and answering questions, paraphrasing and identifying the main idea along with the active participation by students in the comprehension process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The lowest quartile ELA are the readers struggling to comprehend what they read. Teaching comprehension strategies has shown to expand students' long-term reading abilities and leads to reading proficiently. The research suggests teaching these strategies "will empower them and give them more control over their reading and understanding."

Action Steps to Implement

To implement evidence-based practices with fidelity, the first step is training and planning for ongoing coaching and support according to the IRIS Center. Teachers will receive ongoing professional development on the research-based comprehension strategies. This includes support from a NEFEC instructional specialist, who will conduct observations and provide feedback.

Person Responsible Julie Gerhard (julie.gerhard@levyk12.org)

Teachers will present the evidence-based comprehension strategies to students in ELA classes with weekly monitoring by the reading coach or administration.

Person Responsible Cheryl Allen (cheryl.allen@levyk12.org)

Progress monitoring will be used by ELA teachers to measure the impact to learning on the area of focus.

Person Responsible Julie Gerhard (julie.gerhard@levyk12.org)

ELA teachers will meet in teams (POW WOWs) to review and discuss the data and any roadblocks to teaching the comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible Julie Gerhard (julie.gerhard@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The lead team will address the ESSA Federal Index subgoup targets for Black and Multiracial who are below 41% by disaggregating data and collaborating with teachers to develop a focused approach to track and monitor their progress. Professional development in Culturally Responsive Teaching through FDLRS will be offered for teachers.

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.

Twice each year school faculty participate in professional development in parent and family engagement to learn strategies for communication and ways to involve parents in their programs, one of which being Dr. Constantino's Parent Engagement. School board members visit campus several times a year for meetings, events or just to walk through classrooms to see the wonderful things happening. College and career professionals are invited to AVID classrooms as guest speakers. Chiefland Middle High School utilizes social media, email and Skyward to broadcast upcoming events and school news or to distribute electronic surveys for parent input. The SAC meetings have become more flexible with the addition of a virtual platform for some meetings. The school partners with community members for a variety of support for students that ranges from mental and physical health and safety to financial support.

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
		Total:	$0.00