# Crescent City Jr Sr High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Crescent City Jr Sr High School

## 2201 S US HIGHWAY 17, Crescent City, FL 32112

### www.putnamschools.org/o/cchs

## Demographics

# Principal: Tim Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>7-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<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>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (43%)<br><br>2017-18: C (48%)<br><br>2016-17: C (42%)<br><br>2015-16: D (37%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Table of Contents

# Crescent City Jr Sr High School

## 2201 S US HIGHWAY 17, Crescent City, FL 32112

### www.putnamschools.org/o/cchs

## 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 7-12 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 71% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

In partnership with the community, Crescent City High School will prepare students for life after graduation through a challenging curriculum, industry aligned experiences, and a culture that supports personalized learning.

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

Crescent City High School will empower our learning community for opportunities after graduation.

### 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 |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Shelby, John | Principal | Mission, Vision, Goals, Professional Development, Teacher Evaluations |
| Tucker, Michelle | Assistant Principal | Instructional Coach, Masterschedule, MTSS |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Thursday 8/10/2017, Tim Adams

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
31

**Demographic Data**

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | High School 7-12 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (37%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Cassandra Brusca](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 154 | 144 | 127 | 614 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 43 | 240 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 40 | 29 | 14 | 133 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 37 | 11 | 4 | 105 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 30 | 18 | 2 | 95 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 76 | 79 | 52 | 291 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 119 |

**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 | 93 | 69 | 55 | 35 | 252 |

**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 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 37 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/18/2020

## 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 | 180 | 170 | 151 | 106 | 607 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 72 | 62 | 50 | 230 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 38 | 28 | 17 | 134 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 114 | 89 | 46 | 267 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 69 | 53 | 34 | 240 |

**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 | 37 | 57 | 41 | 32 | 167 |

**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 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 6 | | 34 |

**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 | 180 | 170 | 151 | 106 | 607 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 72 | 62 | 50 | 230 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 38 | 28 | 17 | 134 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 114 | 89 | 46 | 267 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 69 | 53 | 34 | 240 |

**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 | 37 | 57 | 41 | 32 | | 167 |

**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 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 6 | | 34 |

## 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 | 34% | 31% | 56% | 23% | 28% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 36% | 34% | 51% | 40% | 40% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 19% | 27% | 42% | 42% | 41% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 26% | 25% | 51% | 22% | 27% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 36% | 43% | 48% | 26% | 27% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 42% | 45% | 35% | 28% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 43% | 39% | 68% | 62% | 53% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 52% | 49% | 73% | 56% | 57% | 70% |

| | EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | | | | **Total** |
| | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| | (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** | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 32% | 41% | -9% | 55% | -23% | |
| | 2018 | 28% | 38% | -10% | 53% | -25% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 32% | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 31% | 41% | -10% | 53% | -22% | |
| | 2018 | 31% | 38% | -7% | 53% | -22% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | | |

| | | | | MATH | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | | |

| | | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 67% | -28% |
| 2018 | 69% | 58% | 11% | 65% | 4% |
| Compare | | -30% | | | |

| 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 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 70% | -20% |
| 2018 | 57% | 53% | 4% | 68% | -11% |
| Compare | | -7% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 12% | 49% | -37% | 61% | -49% |
| 2018 | 31% | 43% | -12% | 62% | -31% |
| Compare | | -19% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 32% | 43% | -11% | 57% | -25% |
| 2018 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 56% | -6% |
| Compare | | -18% | | | |

## 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 | 34 | 35 | 25 | 37 | 38 | | 45 | 45 | | 71 | 20 |
| ELL | 14 | 20 | 12 | 19 | 24 | | 28 | 42 | | 94 | 20 |
| BLK | 22 | 31 | 27 | 22 | 50 | | 43 | 40 | | 81 | 31 |
| HSP | 30 | 31 | 10 | 24 | 25 | 31 | 35 | 50 | | 95 | 42 |
| WHT | 48 | 48 | 33 | 34 | 46 | 58 | 60 | 66 | | 85 | 59 |
| FRL | 33 | 33 | 17 | 23 | 34 | 47 | 37 | 48 | | 88 | 46 |

## 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 | 38 | 30 | 60 | | | | 18 | | 83 | 20 |
| ELL | 9 | 35 | 46 | 24 | 13 | | 55 | 22 | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 43 | 28 | 53 | 46 | | 43 | 46 | | 83 | 24 |
| HSP | 28 | 45 | 43 | 44 | 30 | 23 | 74 | 57 | | 77 | 57 |
| WHT | 39 | 45 | 36 | 47 | 45 | 43 | 76 | 56 | | 69 | 55 |
| FRL | 28 | 45 | 40 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 63 | 53 | | 75 | 47 |

## 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 | 8 | 39 | 33 | 10 | 18 | 23 | 43 | 40 | | 61 | 18 |
| ELL | 6 | 33 | 45 | 15 | 25 | 37 | 50 | | | 50 | 45 |
| BLK | 12 | 37 | 35 | 13 | 30 | 42 | 62 | 33 | | 67 | 25 |
| HSP | 21 | 40 | 45 | 21 | 25 | 35 | 62 | 57 | | 69 | 43 |
| WHT | 34 | 43 | 43 | 26 | 25 | 29 | 67 | 64 | | 60 | 50 |
| FRL | 21 | 41 | 43 | 20 | 27 | 36 | 57 | 53 | | 67 | 42 |

## 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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 54 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 483 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| 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 | 33 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 39 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 54 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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.**

English Language Arts Lowest Quartile Learning Gains and overall Math Proficiency were the weakest scores categorically. The Low Math Proficiency is historically low, however the Math Teacher for Algebra was inexperienced in teaching this subject and the predicted outcome was even lower than expected. The lowest Quartile Learning Gains in ELA were significantly lower than expected based on Progress Monitoring and Teengagment test prep for FSA ELA Reading. This has not been the case for several years and we met fidelity on the curriculum mapping as a school, which is what causes concerns for the current school year.

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

Biology scores decreased by 30%, which is significant decrease for the school overall. The teacher who was in charge of teaching for the last four years was concerned with progress monitoring outcomes throughout the year and her prediction was a 20% decrease from the previous year. In the last four years, she has been within three or fewer percent of her predictions, which was another concern for the overall school grade. She stated over and over in data chats that her students were unmotivated and simply would not stay focused in the classroom or take the progress monitoring tests seriously.

**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.**

Algebra EOC scoring was the lowest scores for the school in comparison to state mean scoring. Historically low Math Proficiency and Learning Gains in elementary and middle school are key contributors to this low proficiency. However, the previous years instruction was well below the measured fidelity for rigor and pacing according to the curriculum guide

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

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains significantly increased. Primarily based on historic low scoring in ALG EOC provided lower scoring students to raise scores at lesser levels according to state grading categories and the Geometry teacher has shown significant increases in Learning Gains for her students in the last two years. She maintained fidelity with the pacing guide, provided two weeks os test prep, and used Cornell Notes all year. She also worked with the school district to create the progress monitoring and had a better understanding the level of rigor to use all year long to measure mastery of her students.

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

Our area of concern is the number of 9th graders with Level 1's on the 2019 statewide ELA and Math assessments. In addition, 33% of students failed a course in English and/or Math.

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

1. Math Proficiency in Algebra and Geometry
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Biology Proficiency
4. US History EOC Proficiency
5. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:
*No activities were entered for this section.*

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Due to significant change in the Master Schedule, Face-to-Face vs. Online Instruction, and significant teacher turnover in tested subjects for the state grading system, we are focusing back on the BASICS.**
**Standards Based Planning and Pacing are the priority! Teachers need to plan and deliver quality and engaging lessons aligned to the standards that meet the level of the standard students will be tested on according test-item specifications for EOC's and state guidelines for the Writing Rubric for Grades 9 and 10. Finally, a school-wide focus on reading informational text as part of the culture in all classrooms.**

## 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.

CCHS is in year three of the FOCUS Team PLC's. All three of these teams meet monthly to support a postive school culture and climate and extend our Mission and Vision into the community.

1. Student Support Team - 20% of Faculty focus on the academic, emotional, physical, and emotional needs of all students grades 9-12.
2. Faculty and Staff Support Team - 25% of Faculty focus on Professional Learning, Peer Support, and positive school culture events each month (lunches, Spirit Warrior, AVID Days, Class visits)
3. Parent and Community Outreach Team - 55% of our Faculty design and execute events throughout the year to involve the community and parents to expand the knowledge of the school's Vision and Mission. Parent Nights, Curriculum Nights, Title I/21st Century Parent Nights, alumni Celebrations, Homecoming recognition, etc.

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

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