Cape Coral High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cape Coral High School

2300 SANTA BARBARA BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33991

http://cch.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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

Cape Coral High School

2300 SANTA BARBARA BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33991

http://cch.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

Empower students to dream, believe, achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student future ready.

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
Engelhart, Chris	Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal *Complete classroom walk-throughs and formal/informal evaluations to evaluate instructional practices. *Participate in leadership team meetings to discuss issues and concerns with department heads. *Hold staff/faculty meetings to inform and discuss current concerns, as well as train faculty and staff. *Evaluate data to help make school-based decisions. *Provide a safe environment for teachers and students to work at a high level.
Beall, Troy	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal *Complete classroom walk-throughs and formal/informal evaluations to evaluate instructional practices. *Participate in leadership team meetings to discuss issues and concerns with department heads. *Hold staff/faculty meetings to inform and discuss current concerns, as well as train faculty and staff. *Evaluate data to help make school-based decisions. *Provide a safe environment for teachers and students to work at a high level.
Gamache, Chelsea	Teacher, ESE	
Isaac, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Gurgal, Alan	Teacher, K-12	Teacher/Instructional Leadership Team Chair
Cornwell, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Teacher/ESE Department Head
Wunderlich, Marla	Assistant Principal	
Holcomb, Jana	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/16/2019, Ryan Jackson

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406	434	409	360	1609
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	17	22	16	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	8	17	14	62
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	39	19	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	18	7	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	56	75	53	244
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	36	71	69	223

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	39	57	72	55	223

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	17

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	422	447	406	367	1642
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	49	57	57	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	37	15	22	100
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	73	41	7	207
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	109	61	26	328

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	80	71	43	19	213

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	422	447	406	367	1642
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	49	57	57	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	37	15	22	100
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	73	41	7	207
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	109	61	26	328

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	80	71	43	19	213

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	64%	55%	56%	66%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	49%	51%	54%	45%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	37%	42%	42%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	54%	50%	51%	52%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	35%	45%	48%	37%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	43%	45%	25%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	70%	62%	68%	69%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	67%	73%	78%	63%	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	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
	2018	65%	51%	14%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	61%	48%	13%	53%	8%
	2018	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					

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%	56%	12%	67%	1%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	60%	61%	-1%	65%	-5%
Compare		8%			

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	78%	64%	14%	70%	8%
2018	74%	62%	12%	68%	6%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	59%	-21%	61%	-23%
2018	33%	60%	-27%	62%	-29%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	50%	12%	57%	5%
2018	56%	53%	3%	56%	0%
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	22	28	24	19	30	24	21	37		71	29
ELL	35	45	43	34	34	43	42	33		71	48
ASN	79	64		79	21			93			
BLK	46	40	25	36	28	31	53	57		93	57
HSP	58	47	35	46	29	29	67	75		87	70
MUL	52	43	30	40				77		82	
WHT	71	54	38	62	42	38	73	86		93	69
FRL	56	49	33	43	32	31	62	71		89	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
SWD	26	33	27	22	14	19	30	46		76	38
ELL	18	31	29	29	45	35	29	40		74	61
ASN	83	70		81	64		85	60		95	70
BLK	43	40	45	30	35	53	26	74		97	51
HSP	65	54	35	43	36	31	56	75		90	69
MUL	73	52		60	57		73	70		100	73
WHT	70	56	41	58	39	15	71	82		92	77
FRL	60	50	36	45	37	30	55	73		94	70
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	47	42	17	22	16	24	48		54	40
ELL	5	47	44	28	33	33	18	33		80	38
ASN	79	63		77	42		89			90	
BLK	55	46	33	41	37	24	58	75		96	33
HSP	59	51	45	47	35	28	63	73		89	61
MUL	70	57		54	57		62			100	70
WHT	70	56	45	55	37	22	73	81		89	64
FRL	58	54	42	45	33	23	60	73		86	55

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	625
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	67
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	47
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	53
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	54
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	63
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	52
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 pass rate for the Algebra 1 EOC was 38%, which is a 5% improvement from 2018-19, but remains our lowest performing area. We experienced multiple personnel issues during the year with one Algebra 1 teacher leaving and one who was on leave for approximately 2 months. We also had two inexperienced Algebra teachers.

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

The pass rate for 10th grade students on the English Language Arts FSA declined by 4% from 2018-19. The average scale score in this area increased by 7% per student. However, these students entered 10th grade with lower proficiency rates, so the overall rate was our greatest decline going from 65% to 61%.

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.

The Algebra 1 test scores have the greatest gap as the pass rate for CCHS is 38% compared to the state average for first time test takers of 62%. As an IB school, we have a significant percentage of our students who enter high school having already passed the Algebra 1 EOC. Secondly, this year we had an Algebra teacher leave part way through the school year, another was out on leave for close to two months, and our third Algebra teacher was a first year teacher.

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

US History was the subject area with the greatest achievement growth. We increased by four percentage points from the 17-18 school year and we are eight percentage points above the state average. One of our US History teachers was in her second year of teaching this subject, which is definitely a contributing factor to our increase. Also, the US History PLC developed standards based bell ringers and exit tickets. The results and data from the bell ringers and exit tickets helped drive instruction.

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

The two areas of concern that have been identified by the SIP team are students with a level one on a state assessment and students with attendance under 90%.

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

1. Algebra 1
2. ELA (10th grade)
3. ELA (9th grade)
4. Student attendance including tardies
5. Student behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2018-2019 school year there was a small increase in Algebra 1 EOC scores, but it still falls 21% below the district average. Algebra 1 is a foundation math course, therefore increased performance in Algebra 1 will help students become more successful as they progress through their math courses.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students who are proficient in Algebra 1 from 38% to 43% as measured by the FY20 Algebra 1 EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Troy Beall (troyab@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers who will be teaching Algebra 1 have been hand selected based on being the best teacher to teach the course. In addition, the students who are in the lowest 25% have been placed in a classroom of a highly effective educator who will loop for two year cycles with the students. WINN Time will also be implemented to help better support student in areas where they are deficient.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the 5% increase last year, we will continue to loop the highly effective educator with the students and also include WINN TIme to better support the students in areas where they are deficient. This year will be first testing cycle for the students who have been looped with the teacher for two years.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Double-block instructional time for Level 1 and Level 2 students.
2. All Algebra I classrooms will have a highly effective teacher hand selected by administration.
3. WINN Time for areas of deficiency

Person Responsible   Troy Beall (troyab@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There was a decline in 10th grade ELA scores from 65% to 61% proficiency. ELA is the foundation for all other academic subject areas; therefore, continuing to promote ELA proficiency will in turn help improve success in other subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students who are proficient in ELA from 61% to 68% as measured by the FY20 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	English teachers will be giving quarterly FSA Writing style exams to students to collect data and adjust instruction. Reading teachers will be using USA Test Prep for individual student instruction, as well as whole group instruction. The lowest performing students in Reading will be double blocked to receive additional support. WINN Time will continue to be utilized in both Reading and English classes. English will be focusing more closely on writing skills, while Reading will focus on reading strategies. All students in both English and Reading will be tracking their progress towards benchmark proficiency through the daily completion of bellringers. A School Wide Writing initiative will continue to be implemented to help gain support for writing in subject areas other than English. In addition, ELA teachers will be increasing the variety of texts students see on a regular basis as well as increase their level of complex questioning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading and writing strategies have to be explicitly taught in order for comprehension skills to increase. Specific alignment to standards and common formative and summative assessments will allow teachers to see when students have mastered standards and when more intervention is needed in order to achieve student gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards-based bell ringers.
2. School-wide writing initiative.
3. 70% informational text and 30% literature will be used in all classrooms.
4. WINN Time for standards in which students are not showing proficiency.
5. Quarterly FSA writing style exams.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There was a decline in 9th grade ELA scores from 65% to 63% proficiency. ELA is the foundation for all other academic subject areas; therefore, continuing to promote ELA proficiency will in turn help improve success in other subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students who are proficient in ELA from 63% to 67% as measured by the FY20 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	English teachers will be giving quarterly FSA Writing style exams to students to collect data and adjust instruction. Reading teachers will be using USA Test Prep for individual student instruction, as well as whole group instruction. The lowest performing students in Reading will be double blocked to receive addition support. WINN Time will continue to be utilized in both Reading and English classes. English will be focusing more closely on writing skills, while Reading will focus on reading strategies. All students in both English and Reading will be tracking their progress towards benchmark proficiency through the daily completion of bellringers. A School Wide Writing initiative is being implemented to help gain support for writing in subject areas other than English. In addition, ELA teachers will be increasing the variety of texts students see on a regular basis as well as increase their level of complex questioning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading and writing strategies have to be explicitly taught in order for comprehension skills to increase. Specific alignment to standards and common formative and summative assessments will allow teachers to see when students have mastered standards and when more intervention is needed in order to achieve student gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards-based bell ringers.
2. School-wide writing initiative.
3. 70% informational text and 30% literature will be used in all classrooms.
4. WINN Time for standards in which students are not showing proficiency.
5. Quarterly FSA writing style exams.

Person Responsible	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD will be an area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY19.

Measurable Outcome:	SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for SWD students at Cape Coral High School. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student behavior in the classroom not only impacts the success of the individual student, but it also impacts the overall success of the class. By eliminating negative student behaviors, students will see greater academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of overall referrals from a daily average of 4.8 to 4.5 as reported to District Support Applications by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will set clear expectations for all students and communicate these expectations to students and the students' families. Teachers will be encouraged to use Restorative Practice action steps to address undesired student behavior (steps include: warning, parent contact, and team-timeout). In addition, a PBS Program is being developed to help encourage desired behaviors through a rewards system.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The utilization of restorative practices will create a culture where students have accountability but will return to a supportive and productive learning environment. By reinforcing positive behavior students will adhere to school-wide expectations and focus on academics.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will set clear classroom expectations.
2. Teachers will communicate these expectations to students
3. Teachers will be encouraged to use Restorative Practices.
4. Teachers and staff will utilize the PBS system in place.
5. Teachers will create a culture within their classroom that foster learning

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance is paramount to the academic success of a student. It is necessary to focus on methods to help improve overall student attendance so that all students have a greater opportunity to be successful. Attendance/truancy issues impact all grade levels and subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the annual daily average of student attendance from 94.08% to 94.20% as reported by the Attendance District Cycle reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Troy Beall (troyab@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Action steps include encouraging teachers to take accurate attendance and update their attendance book when necessary. Data can only be tracked if it is being recorded accurately. An automated phone message is sent out to all parents in the morning to inform them their student is absent. Informing parents on a daily basis of their students' attendance will help promote students coming to school more frequently. The LCSD Credit Loss Policy which is tied to attendance will be implemented; therefore, students will have an academic incentive to attend school. Lastly, we are also implementing the Check & Connect formalized mentoring program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When a student is not at school, it is a missed opportunity to learn. Implementing a PBS system, as well as credit loss consequences, will encourage student to attend school more regularly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Accurate attendance taken by teachers.
2. Data tracking and monitoring daily.
3. Automated message is sent to parents every day that students are absent.
4. LCSD Credit Loss Policy is in effect.
5. Check and Connect formalized mentoring program.

Person Responsible	Chris Engelhart (christianje@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Staff development will be addressed in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), during ongoing Faculty Meetings, in Open Classrooms, and through Learning Walks. The Instructional Leadership Team will prioritize staff development and work with school leadership and the teachers in their departments to address individual learning needs.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**