

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Chamberlain High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Chamberlain High School

9401 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33612

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Jake Russell

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: D (37%)<br>2015-16: D (36%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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](http://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**

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Chamberlain High School

9401 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33612

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | Yes                    | 89%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 87%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | C       | D       |

### 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.

To provide an environment for students to master disciplinary literacy across all content areas.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

At Chamberlain, all stakeholders work together to create a learning community where students are held to high expectations. The Chamberlain community builds students who are caring, contributing citizens that can succeed in an ever-changing world.

### 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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Russell, Jake     | Principal           |                                 |
| Woods, Jody       | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Suarez, Luis      | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Smith, Jean       | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Scurry, Latasha   | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Buchert, Danielle | Other               |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Jake Russell

**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.*

3

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

#### Demographic Data

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File) | Active |
|--|--------|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: D (37%)<br>2015-16: D (36%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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 | 370 | 345 | 351 | 325 | 1391  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 150 | 149 | 135 | 590   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 5   | 10  | 6   | 34    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 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 | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 154 | 130 | 116 | 577   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 44  | 21  | 82  | 291   |

**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 | 9 | 1  | 4  | 4     | 18 |

**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 | 10 | 0  | 0  | 2  | 12 |       |
| 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**

Thursday 10/29/2020

**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 | 398 | 368 | 349 | 396 | 1511 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 112 | 111 | 165 | 497  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80  | 59  | 46  | 35  | 220  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 91  | 87  | 58  | 375  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 112 | 43  | 156  |       |

**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 | 101 | 76 | 95 | 80 | 352 |       |

**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 | 398 | 368 | 349 | 396 | 1511  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 112 | 111 | 165 | 497   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80  | 59  | 46  | 35  | 220   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 91  | 87  | 58  | 375   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 112 | 43  | 156   |

**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 | 101 | 76 | 95 | 80 | 352   |

**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             | 28%    | 56%      | 56%   | 27%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 47%    | 54%      | 51%   | 34%    | 50%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 45%    | 41%      | 42%   | 30%    | 39%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 40%    | 49%      | 51%   | 24%    | 51%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 63%    | 48%      | 48%   | 31%    | 47%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 56%    | 45%      | 45%   | 36%    | 38%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 42%    | 69%      | 68%   | 35%    | 62%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 60%    | 75%      | 73%   | 51%    | 74%      | 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 | 26%    | 55%      | -29%                       | 55%   | -29%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 26%    | 53%      | -27%                       | 53%   | -27%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 26%    | 53%      | -27%                       | 53%   | -27%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 31%    | 52%      | -21%                       | 53%   | -22%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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        | 41%    | 66%      | -25%                  | 67%   | -26%               |
| 2018        | 51%    | 62%      | -11%                  | 65%   | -14%               |
| Compare     |        | -10%     |                       |       |                    |
| 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         | 58%    | 73%      | -15%                  | 70%   | -12%               |
| 2018         | 50%    | 70%      | -20%                  | 68%   | -18%               |
| Compare      |        | 8%       |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 24%    | 63%      | -39%                  | 61%   | -37%               |
| 2018         | 55%    | 63%      | -8%                   | 62%   | -7%                |
| Compare      |        | -31%     |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 47%    | 57%      | -10%                  | 57%   | -10%               |
| 2018         | 44%    | 56%      | -12%                  | 56%   | -12%               |
| Compare      |        | 3%       |                       |       |                    |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 17       | 45     | 46          | 28        | 61      |              | 27       | 44      |           | 78                | 11                  |
| ELL                                       | 19       | 48     | 41          | 36        | 64      | 50           | 43       | 42      |           | 71                | 44                  |
| ASN                                       |          | 40     |             |           |         |              |          | 80      |           | 100               | 69                  |
| BLK                                       | 15       | 38     | 44          | 27        | 61      | 57           | 30       | 43      |           | 84                | 5                   |
| HSP                                       | 32       | 50     | 41          | 45        | 63      | 62           | 43       | 60      |           | 80                | 37                  |
| MUL                                       | 40       | 47     |             | 33        |         |              | 30       | 71      |           | 86                | 25                  |
| WHT                                       | 46       | 56     | 71          | 48        | 75      |              | 66       | 75      |           | 87                | 48                  |
| FRL                                       | 25       | 46     | 44          | 38        | 65      | 60           | 39       | 55      |           | 81                | 24                  |
| 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                                       | 12       | 39     | 42          | 24        | 50      |              | 45       | 38      |           | 63                | 4                   |
| ELL                                       | 3        | 33     | 31          | 35        | 63      | 36           | 50       | 33      |           | 77                | 42                  |
| ASN                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          | 64      |           | 100               | 36                  |
| BLK                                       | 15       | 39     | 50          | 29        | 53      | 56           | 43       | 31      |           | 73                | 18                  |
| HSP                                       | 33       | 45     | 40          | 47        | 62      | 48           | 67       | 59      |           | 87                | 37                  |
| MUL                                       | 19       | 37     |             | 77        |         |              |          | 50      |           | 100               | 27                  |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 54     | 44          | 63        | 77      |              | 68       | 69      |           | 91                | 28                  |
| FRL                                       | 26       | 43     | 45          | 44        | 61      | 50           | 59       | 48      |           | 84                | 26                  |

| 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                                       | 3        | 22     | 25          | 7         | 22      | 31           | 8        | 19      |           | 51                | 15                  |
| ELL                                       | 6        | 24     | 23          | 18        | 36      | 38           | 15       | 39      |           | 65                | 44                  |
| ASN                                       | 45       | 43     |             | 56        | 38      |              |          | 60      |           | 73                |                     |
| BLK                                       | 16       | 27     | 32          | 13        | 25      | 37           | 24       | 35      |           | 63                | 8                   |
| HSP                                       | 27       | 36     | 30          | 24        | 34      | 35           | 33       | 51      |           | 74                | 30                  |
| MUL                                       | 28       | 36     |             | 37        | 26      |              | 42       | 50      |           | 81                | 15                  |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 40     | 25          | 35        | 34      | 38           | 52       | 76      |           | 76                | 36                  |
| FRL                                       | 21       | 32     | 32          | 22        | 30      | 38           | 28       | 48      |           | 68                | 23                  |

### 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  | 50   |
| 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 | 54   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 549  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11   |
| Percent Tested  | 96%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 40   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 47   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0    |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 72  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 40  |
| 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  | 52  |
| 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   | 47  |
| 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   | 64  |
| 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                                | 49  |
| 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.**

The ELA component showed the lowest performance. The largest contributing factor is that 75% percent of our 9th graders are below grade level.

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

Science scores declined by 17 percent (from 59 to 42). Scheduling efforts have been improved to ensure students are being scheduled strategically in 9th and 10th grade to maximize biology readiness.

**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.**

9th grade reading has a 27% gap when compared to the state average. The largest contributing factor is that 75% percent of our 9th graders are below grade level.

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

Math showed the most improvement. New actions included strategic scheduling for students based on assessment scores, hiring effective teachers to teach the content, addition of a math resource teachers allowed more opportunities for teacher growth and PD in the subject area.

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

1. High level of level 1 students in all grades.
2. High number of students displaying two or more at risk factors.

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

1. Behavior
2. ELA
3. Attendance
4. SWD
5. Course Performance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Seventy-five percent of students are below grade level entering the ninth grade. Standards-aligned instruction is necessary to better prepare students with the ability to demonstrate learning gains and proficiency on state assessments. Disciplinary literacy is central to standards-aligned instruction. Teachers need to plan and deliver high-quality lessons which center on both content and literacy skills and standards to provide students access to challenging content and texts.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | To increase proficiency and learning gains in all components of school grade by 3 percent with a focus on African American students and SWD students.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create coaching team to support core area instruction to align to content and literacy standards</li> <li>2. Use a schoolwide evidence gathering tool to support reading and writing using the Scratch Paper Method</li> <li>3. All core contents will utilize Common Assessments and Unpacking charts/Concept Posters</li> <li>4. All elective courses will include vocabulary instruction as a cornerstone to their units of study</li> <li>5. Teacher-led walkthroughs (GEMBA Walks) that will determine next steps in teacher professional development needs to increase student learning</li> <li>6. Utilizing the SF support model to address learning needs of SWD students</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | By focusing our coaching team to better align literacy within content, we will better support teacher planning and instruction. Support will be provided by coaches, lead teachers, department heads and administrators. Common Assessments and Common writing will enable teachers to see gaps in student understanding via discussion of data and progress monitoring. The use of a common system for evidence gathering will help students navigate challenging texts. Vocabulary instruction will allow students to raise their comprehension levels when reading. Monthly GEMBA walks will be conducted by teachers. Data collected will determine the professional development offerings to support standards-aligned instruction. The SF model allows teachers to address specific SWD student's needs. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Scratch Paper- All teachers will be trained and this strategy will be used in all classrooms. This will occur June 2020 and Preplanning 2020

1. Targeted coaching
  - a. Coaching team is composed of two math resource teacher, reading coach, science coach
  - c. Coaches will support students through differentiated support for teachers based on student and assessment data.
  - d. Coaching team progress monitoring will be overseen by Jody Woods, Assistant Principal for Curriculum.
2. Common Assessments
  - a. Common assessments will be created by each department to facilitate pedagogical discussion through



PLC's.

- b. Common assessments will be standards based and will occur regularly in each department.
- c. Common assessment planning meetings will also be implemented once a week to ensure fidelity and progress monitor the effectiveness of the common assessments.
- d. Common assessments are overseen by the instructional coaches (reading coach, writing coach, science coach, and math coach).

### 3. Professional Development

- a. Professional development will occur regularly throughout the 20-21 school year.
- b. PD will be offered to strengthen teacher skills in both the PEAK and Tommie Mabry instructional models.
- c. PD will also occur at a differentiated level based on individual department academic data and overall school grade data.
- d. PD will be overseen by the instructional coaches (reading coach, writing coach, science coach, and math coach).

### 4. Admin/Coach Walk-through's

- a. Admin/coach walk-through's use the instructional strategies being taught by Steven Cousins.
- b. Walk-through's will use the Gemba model as outlined by consultant Steven Cousins.
- c. Admin/coach walk-through's will occur weekly with feedback being given to teachers at the end of each day or week.
- d. Admin/coach walk-through's will be overseen by Jody Woods, Assistant Principal for Curriculum.

### 5. Saturday school tutoring

- a. Tutoring will be available at various points throughout the 20-21 school year to students at Chamberlain.
- b. Tutoring sessions will focus on standards-based instruction, grade enhancement, and content-based gaps that emerge throughout the school year.
- c. Tutoring will be overseen by the instructional coaches (reading coach, science coach, and math coach).
- 6. SF teachers will meet with SWD student's to go over progress in their classes and reading/writing

**Person Responsible** Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Vocabulary Strategy PD for elective teachers. This PD is designed specifically for elective teachers during one Tuesday PLC time each month.

**Person Responsible** Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Common Assessment and Common Writing Plan, Calendar and PLC discussions. All core PLCS will address scores and align plans for remediation based on assessment data.

**Person Responsible** Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Our African American subgroup performed under the 41 percent threshold.

**Measurable Outcome:** To improve our African American subgroup scores above 41 percent

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Provide students access to culturally appropriate and relevant text
2. Provide targeted ELP to students which has an emphasis on both relationship building and academics
3. Plan monthly intervention and pullouts for specific students starting in September to provide extra time for remediation
4. Utilize AVID WICOR strategies to provide students additional academic support

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Culturally relevant text will provide students with a way to relate to academic text and pull from background knowledge. Targeted ELP will support remediation to students and foster mentorships. Monthly interventions will allow progress monitoring to occur in core classrooms as well as fill in learning gaps from e-Learning. Organizational tools and academic support with AVID strategies will support student learning and drive home the importance of grades.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Targeted ELP and staff mentorship opportunities

**Person Responsible** Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

AVID Schoolwide strategy PD sessions

**Person Responsible** Jody Woods (jody.woods@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Pull-outs and targeted remediation from coaches, leads and teachers

**Person Responsible** Danielle Buchert (danielle.buchert@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**See Above**

**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.

For the 2020-2021 school year a school culture committee has been formed. The committee is divided into three sub-groups (staff culture, student culture, and community culture). The focus of this group is to work alongside the different stakeholder groups to determine which areas of school culture needs attention. Based on the recommendation from the culture committee, action plans will be created to work on those identified areas. Any concerns with student behavior that affect school culture will be completed by the RTI specialist as outlined in the Title 1 CNA plan that was submitted to the district.

The areas below will also be focused on through the culture committee.

1. Camaraderie among all stakeholders (students, staff, and community)
2. Work alongside the Chamberlain Alliance alumni group to continue supporting past, current, and future student at Chamberlain.
3. Focus on having the Student leadership groups play an active role in creating activities that help create a sense of community among all students
  - Student leadership will work with student culture committee to meet with school leadership to discuss ideas for improving culture
  - Student ran incentive program through student leadership groups
  - Using the morning show as a way to broadcast student led initiatives
4. PD led by the school leadership team on creating the "why" behind CHS teaching

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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