

Putnam County School District

Crescent City Jr Sr High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

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 (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](#).

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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 (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	0	189	154	144	127	614
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	50	40	29	14	133
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	45	30	18	2	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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 positive 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.