
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	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Chipley High School

1545 BRICKYARD RD, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://chs.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Clemmons

Start Date for this Principal: 9/29/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Washington 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	17

Chipley High School

1545 BRICKYARD RD, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://chs.wcsdschools.com>

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	Yes	71%
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	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Washington 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.

The mission of Chipley High School is to instill values, to develop skills, and to establish goals that will enable lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that all students can and must be successful learners.

We believe that all students should have the opportunity to develop personal, social, academic, physical and vocational competencies.

We believe that the dignity and worth of each individual student must be honored and respected.

We believe that experiences should be provided for students to develop a lasting appreciation of our American heritage and democratic process.

We believe that teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and our community share the responsibility for facilitating our school mission and goals.

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
Clemmons, Alicia	Principal	
Henderson, Lenora	Teacher, K-12	
Schimpf, Carol	Teacher, K-12	
Webb, Alex	Teacher, K-12	
Kincaid, Jennifer	Administrative Support	
Cox, Sam	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/29/2020, Alicia Clemmons

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	180	176	150	134	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	11	12	10	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	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	36	39	25	25	125

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	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	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/29/2020

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	0	171	145	151	133	600
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	31	29	48	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	23	14	14	69
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	11	19	7	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	25	25	125

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	27	27	23	20	97

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	171	145	151	133	600
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	31	29	48	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	23	14	14	69
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	11	19	7	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	25	25	125

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	27	27	23	20	97

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	50%	48%	56%	49%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	46%	51%	43%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	32%	42%	39%	37%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	45%	41%	51%	48%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	45%	48%	51%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	38%	45%	41%	50%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	70%	68%	56%	58%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	67%	73%	60%	66%	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	51%	47%	4%	55%	-4%
	2018	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	48%	47%	1%	53%	-5%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	68%	67%	1%	67%	1%
2018	68%	60%	8%	65%	3%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			
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	62%	65%	-3%	70%	-8%
2018	65%	58%	7%	68%	-3%
Compare		-3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	49%	-21%	61%	-33%
2018	38%	56%	-18%	62%	-24%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	49%	6%	57%	-2%
2018	49%	41%	8%	56%	-7%
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	24	27	27	23	37	35	58	60		80	50
BLK	40	36	38	42	42	30	43	21		88	57
WHT	52	49	35	45	45	28	72	68		91	76
FRL	46	46	45	39	42	33	55	53		87	66
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	32	37	25	28	20	38	17		78	7
BLK	44	48	36	28	39	33	36	36		78	39
MUL	54	58		20	30						
WHT	52	52	58	50	45	31	74	66		92	63

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
FRL	44	49	44	38	39	38	48	46		79	39
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	6	24	32	21	32	18	20	40		50	
BLK	29	34	38	19	34	33	21	39		74	35
MUL	47	47		26	35		40	36			
WHT	54	46	38	54	55	44	63	66		91	52
FRL	32	31	33	33	45	48	39	53		85	27

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	55
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	44
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
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	51
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 lowest 25th percentile (38) compared to the state average (42).
Math lowest 25th percentile (29) compared to the state average (45).

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile (38) indicating a decline from (52) in 2018. The factor(s) that contributed to this decline include a need for professional development on backwards design, and the need for ongoing classroom level formative assessments designed to inform teachers on next steps for instruction.

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.

Math lowest 25th percentile (29) compared to the state average (45). The factor(s) that contributed to this decline include a need for professional development on backwards design, and the need for ongoing classroom level formative assessments designed to inform teachers on next steps for instruction.

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

Math achievement and math learning gains both increased by 1 percent. New actions include an ongoing emphasis on backwards design, and data driven (formative and summative results) instruction to guide next steps in the instructional process.

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

Attendance
Students failing math/reading

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

1. Intensive Reading classes available for all level 1,2 students.
2. Intensive Math classes for all level 1,2 students.
3. MTSS
4. Professional Development (Backwards design, Data analysis).
5. School-wide culture, (access and equity for all students, growth mindset, WICOR)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA lowest 25th percentile proficiency (38) compared to the state average (42). The area of focus is targeted based on the prior year needs assessment/analysis results.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the lowest 25th percentile in ELA will score at or above the state average during the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide emphasis on WICOR, RIGOR Math Remediation Course MTSS, to include targeted interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior year assessment/analysis results were used to determine areas of focus.

Action Steps to Implement

Intensive reading classes provided for all level 1,2 struggling readers.
 Professional development: backwards design
 Professional development: data driven instruction (formative and summative)
 School-wide emphasis on access and equity, and growth mindset
Person Responsible Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math lowest 25th percentile proficiency score (29) compared to the state average (45). Area of focus targeted based on the prior year needs assessment/analysis results.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the lowest percentile in math will score at or above the state average during the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide emphasis on WICOR, RIGOR Professional development: backwards design Professional development: data driven instruction (formative and summative results) MTSS to include deficit specific interventions School-wide emphasis on access and equity, growth mindset
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior year needs assessment/analysis results were used to determine areas of focus.

Action Steps to Implement

School-wide emphasis on WICOR, RIGOR
 Professional development: backwards design (Academic Analyst)
 Professional development: data driven instruction (formative and summative results) (Academic Analyst)
 MTSS to include deficit specific interventions (Academic Analyst, Reading and Math teacher(s))
 School-wide emphasis on access and equity, growth mindset (Principal)
Person Responsible Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Chipley High School will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities by placing a strong emphasis on WICOR strategies, RIGOR, equity and access for all students, Students progress will be monitored using classroom and state level progress monitoring results.

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.

CHS strives to build relationships with local community partners to share responsibility in obtaining resources and support for clubs, activities, and various educational initiatives.

CHS students are recognized for academic achievements by local businesses and partnerships with community based organizations.

Community Partner Programs Include: Take Stock in Children, a Plethora of educational scholarships, and College and Career Readiness resources and 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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00