South County Career Center

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South County Career Center

2810 JOHN SHERMAN WAY, Ruskin, FL 33570

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	CS&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 Hillsborough 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

South County Career Center

2810 JOHN SHERMAN WAY, Ruskin, FL 33570

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
Grade			

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

SCCC will provide and comprehensive, collaborative environment to nurture and ensure the academic and personal success of our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South County Career Center provides an opportunity for our students to achieve academic success and to move forward towards their career. It is the goal of our faculty and staff to assist our students so that they may be successful in their coursework, earn a High School Diploma, and either further their education or seek gainful employment. Support is provided to help our students achieve the skills and attitudes essential for success in their careers as well as their lives.

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
Woods, Jennifer	Principal	
Fernandez, Carole	Assistant Principal	
Caplinger, Juanita	SAC Member	
Thomas, Victoria	Other	
Lerch, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Jennifer Davis

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	CS&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	1	0	2	1	3	18	10	17	58	96	206
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	10	6	11	22	45	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	10	3	8	29	28	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	14	26	26	3	83
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	14	26	26	3	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	6	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	6	35

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	1	0	1	0	2	1	15	8	30	42	9	109

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	7	7
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

Tuesday 10/20/2020

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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	0%	57%	61%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	62%	0%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	52%	0%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	50%	56%	0%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	78%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**														**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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**
03	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	54%	-54%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	15%	52%	-37%	53%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	29%	-29%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	11%	66%	-55%	67%	-56%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		11%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	19%	73%	-54%	70%	-51%
2018	32%	70%	-38%	68%	-36%
Compare		-13%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	4%	63%	-59%	62%	-58%
Compare		-4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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		25						27		31	
ELL										35	
BLK										53	
HSP										40	
WHT								31		40	10
FRL		16			23			14		45	
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
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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	13
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	104
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	84%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	7
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	20
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	12
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

The only school data provided relates to the Biology, Algebra, and Geometry EOC's, which all students did not take in the previous year due to COVID19.
Continuing from the 2019-2020 SIP, we can expect that by implementing school wide changes in professional development offerings, managing student expectations, and fostering independence in our students we anticipate a significant increase in EOC scores over the 2018-2019 school year. Previously a decline was noticed between the 2018-2019 school year, but was better than the 2017-2018 school year. In light of this, the overall goal is to surpass the 2018-2019 school year test scores.

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

There are significant gaps in our data information at this time; data has gaps due to COVID19. Most students at SCCC are one or more years behind their graduation cohort when they enroll at SCCC. The main contributors to these are longstanding attendance difficulties and low performance at their previous / traditional high school.
The previously identified greatest decline was the percent of students meeting the ELA/Reading graduation requirement. We had begun implementing a stricter policy regarding Edgenuity, our main educational platform, however due to COVID19 the data is incomplete as to whether it was successful. We will meet or exceed the bar we set in the 2019-2020 SIP for our Edgenuity procedures.

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.

For the 2019-2020 SIP we submitted that due to the use of FSA or concordant or EOC scores there is no ability to make a meaningful comparison to the state average. Combined with the lack of test scores from last year due to COVID-19 we maintain that there is no ability to compare to the state average.

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

EOC data showed the most improvement. Due to COVID19 FSA and Alg 1 data was only provided for the first semester. Before the first semester testing occurred, SCCC identified areas of need and held boot camps to address the needs of the current students.

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

No data was provided in Part 1(D)

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

1. FSA/EOC and SAT/ACT preparation
2. Improve overall attendance
3. Increase industry certifications

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers across curriculum will understand and disaggregate current assessment scores and student achievement levels; utilizing content specific vocabulary strategies will result in students achieving passing score and/or indicated personal increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Fully implemented, teachers will be able to individually understand and discuss data (data chats). Fully implemented, teachers will incorporate content specific vocabulary strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Woods (jenniferl.woods@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Defining Words Within Context
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that when words and easy-to-understand explanations are introduced in context, knowledge of those words increases (Biemiller and Boote, 2006) and word meanings are better learned (Stahl and Fairbanks, 1986). When an unfamiliar word is likely to affect comprehension, the most effective time to introduce the word's meaning may be at the moment the word is met in the text.

Action Steps to Implement

PD related to role play by reading teachers to show what a data chat entails.
PD related to each score breakdown (FSA, PERT, ALG EOC, SAT, ACT, PSAT).
PD related to disaggregating senior data by groups on teachers lead by English/Reading/Math leaders.
Non-evaluative observation of data chats by administration and/or peers.
PD by faculty members monthly to highlight vocabulary strategy being utilized.
Incorporate a vocabulary section into students AVID binders
Utilize vocabulary in guided notes for edgenuity classes.
Incorporate a visual representation of vocabulary strategy.
Incorporate vocabulary into Look-For's in daily walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Woods (jenniferl.woods@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers across curriculum will utilize content specific vocabulary strategies supporting ELL, SWD, White, Black, Hispanic, and Economically disadvantaged students.
ELL students- Edgenuity can/will be in native language; vocab section in AVID binder; guided notes available; visual representations of vocab; weekly ILT monitoring for attendance, behavior; bi-weekly ILT meeting for academic monitoring
Black students- vocab section in AVID binder; guided notes available; visual representations of vocab; weekly ILT monitoring for attendance, behavior; bi-weekly ILT meeting for academic monitoring
SWD- Accommodations on Edgenuity will be provided; vocab section in AVID binder; guided notes available; visual representations of vocab; weekly ILT monitoring for attendance, behavior; bi-weekly ILT meeting for academic monitoring
White- vocab section in AVID binder; guided notes available; visual representations of vocab; weekly ILT monitoring for attendance, behavior; bi-weekly ILT meeting for academic monitoring
Hispanic- vocab section in AVID binder; guided notes available; visual representations of vocab; weekly ILT monitoring for attendance, behavior; bi-weekly ILT meeting for academic monitoring
Economically disadvantaged- Social worker intervention; vocab section in AVID binder; guided notes available; visual representations of vocab; weekly ILT monitoring for attendance, behavior; bi-weekly ILT meeting for academic monitoring

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.

SCCC addresses building a positive school culture / environment via the following methods
1) Teacher Leadership
Administration directly (through feedback, observation cycles, chosen PD sessions, etc.) fosters teacher leadership. This then enhances student learning by producing autonomy in students. Teachers who feel that they have authority and leadership in their classroom are better equipped to foster independent learning strategies in their students which has long term successes in and out of the classroom environment.
2) Student Opportunities
SCCC is continually expanding its horizons through bringing in guest speakers, exploring community partnerships, and thoroughly preparing its students for life outside of highschool. In the 2020-2021 year, as identified in the needs assessment/analysis section, SCCC will actively explore how to increase industry certification offerings in order to graduate our students with the best chance of immediate success post high school.

3) Professional Learning

Professional learning communities are the eyes and ears of the student, faculty, and staff body. Perhaps the most active PLC is the positive behavior system PLC. They, along with direct input from the student advisory committee composed of both career side and behavior center students, created the reward system for the school. The use of these rewards for positive behavior (defined as attendance, point sheet data, course progress data etc.) lead to improvements in the student body. Actively engaging with parents aided in increasing student successes: positive calls home, incentivized family/teacher conferences, and parent surveys were used as feedback along with other means.

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: Professional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00