

The School District of Lee County

Island Coast High School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Island Coast High School

2125 DE NAVARRA PKWY, Cape Coral, FL 33909

<http://ich.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Cort

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (42%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Island Coast High School

2125 DE NAVARRA PKWY, Cape Coral, FL 33909

<http://ich.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">57%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		C	C	C

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.

The mission of Island Coast High School is to prepare all students for post secondary success through attendance, behavior and classroom instruction and drop out prevention.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a school where all students are held to high standards of excellence and graduate prepared to excel in the 21st century.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cort-Mora, Michelle	Principal	
Anderson Thomas, Chevoneese	Assistant Principal	
Cain, Leigh Ann	Assistant Principal	
Auer, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Lemme, Michael	Dean	Responsible for School discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Michelle Cort

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

109

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,612

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

25

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
22

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	422	402	449	339	1612
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	122	139	116	492
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	20	34	15	103
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	55	90	77	228
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	65	77	164
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	110	134	107	462
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	170	204	84	577
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	153	210	148	628

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	333	413	351	311	1408
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	49	54	53	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	21	20	15	95
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	75	33	15	128
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	18	30	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	90	86	99	358
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	70	57	105	297

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	66	91	65	96	318

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	0	0	3	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3	13

2020-21 - 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	333	413	351	311	1408
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	49	54	53	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	21	20	15	95
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	75	33	15	128
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	18	30	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	90	86	99	358
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	70	57	105	297

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	66	91	65	96	318

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	0	0	3	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3	13

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				39%	55%	56%	35%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				37%	49%	51%	37%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				25%	37%	42%	27%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				31%	50%	51%	41%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				28%	45%	48%	37%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	43%	45%	43%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				47%	62%	68%	89%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				53%	67%	73%	55%	66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	33%	48%	-15%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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
2021					
2019	45%	56%	-11%	67%	-22%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	51%	64%	-13%	70%	-19%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	32%	59%	-27%	61%	-29%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	50%	-23%	57%	-30%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	74/33.9	108/34.6	117/40.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/15	5/17.2	6/23.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/8	1/4.2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58/35.2	59/31.6	62/34.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/16.7	0/0	1/4.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/10.5	1/5.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	108/77.1	123/84.2	117/83.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	4/80	3/75	1/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100/33.7	133/34.1	131/37.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	6/16.2	4/8.3	6/14.6
	English Language Learners	4/14.3	3/7.1	2/5.9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51/32.1	51/29.8	37/23.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/22.2	2/10	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/20	4/23.5	1/6.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	16/30.2	25/45.5	30/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/28.6	6/75	3/37.5
	English Language Learners	2/22.2	2/20	3/30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/100	2/66.7	3/60
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68/57.6	79/62.7	86/69.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/60	4/50	4/44.4
	English Language Learners	2/28.6	3/37.5	4/40

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners		N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners		N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		0/0	1/100	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		5/62.5	7/63.6	7/77.7
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		1/50	1/50	1/100
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	1/100

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	25	16	5	11	14	16	22		89	28
ELL	16	32	29	7	14	21	18	19		100	41
ASN	64										
BLK	22	33	21	11	14	14	20	32		92	18
HSP	33	35	28	19	13	13	42	41		98	49

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	29	35		5	14						
WHT	33	27	26	30	16	7	45	59		98	53
FRL	30	29	20	21	16	14	37	40		97	47
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	11	22	19	15	22	22	23	33		91	18
ELL	12	25	16	32	44	45	37	37		88	42
BLK	23	26	11	19	16	29	36	38		91	20
HSP	38	39	27	29	31	43	48	50		93	39
MUL	50	29		32	13		63				
WHT	43	39	30	35	29	22	47	58		95	34
FRL	34	33	25	28	23	26	44	46		94	34
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	13	31	23	16				40		64	22
ELL	16	41	35	26	50			29		80	63
BLK	37	41	38	37	28			65		87	37
HSP	29	34	27	37	40	47	87	46		94	56
MUL	44	33						65			
WHT	38	39	26	44	38	50	89	57		86	47
FRL	33	34	28	40	36	49	88	54		89	51

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	21
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

A common trend across the school is having an increase in school grade based on star data. The first trend was a 1% increase in school grade components for ICBS, 40% for Q1, then 41% for Q2, and 42% for Q3. A second trend was seen across the school was only having around 70% of all students taking STAR assessments. The third trend was the decrease in proficiency and learning gains in math scores based on STAR.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest area of need for ICBS is the decrease in proficiency and learning gains in math. Proficiency decreased from 26%(Baseline) to 24%(March) STAR. Learning gains also decreased from 21%(Baseline) to 17%(March) STAR.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement? We will have a target of 95% of ICBS students to test each quarter for STAR. Admin will set up tables in the front lobby to meet students that are late to school to help decrease student tardiness. Full time social worker will follow up with students with excessive absences. We are pulling data in baseball card every day of the window for STAR testing and reporting back to teachers to help them monitor students who have not tested.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The best improvement was in ELA proficiency that increased from 34% Q1 to 39% Q3, and U.S. History increased from 46% Q1 to 59% Q3.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Use of instructional guides and use of district support personnel to help bring in empirically based instructional best practices. The school used data based PLC's to drill down into the instructional guides.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

? Cross curricular PLC's have increased the level of knowledge for all subject's area teachers while looking at student data and creating an action plan for teachers. The PLC was able to drill down into standards that students were struggling with and disseminate those standards across the grade level to have non-core teachers incorporate into their daily lesson plans. The Reading Coach will reach out to make sure ELA standards are being incorporated in lessons and/or modeling for teachers.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders. District level PLC PD for facilitators, PD for all teachers on High-Yield strategies, APPLES PD that follows up on the months previous PD.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

H. Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond. We have implemented back on track tutoring after school. All of the teachers are using PLC's to look at data from baseball card.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA is a focus here at ICHS
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase ELA by 5 percentage points
Monitoring:	Weekly PLC
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Vaping and Insubordination continues to be an issue across all grade levels.

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.

We have monthly staff appreciation celebrations

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

We utilize the PBIS team.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00