

Washington County School District

Chipleigh 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Chipley High School

1545 BRICKYARD RD, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://chs.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Clemmons

Start Date for this Principal: 9/29/2020

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)	75%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Washington 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	21

Chipley High School

1545 BRICKYARD RD, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://chs.wcsdschools.com>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Washington 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 Chipley High School is to instill values, to develop skills, and to establish goals that will enable lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that all students can and must be successful learners.

We believe that all students should have the opportunity to develop personal, social, academic, physical and vocational competencies.

We believe that the dignity and worth of each individual student must be honored and respected.

We believe that experiences should be provided for students to develop a lasting appreciation of our American heritage and democratic process.

We believe that teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and our community share the responsibility for facilitating our school mission and goals.

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
Clemmons, Alicia	Principal	
Webb, Alex	Teacher, K-12	
Kincaid, Jennifer	Administrative Support	
Cox, Sam	Assistant Principal	
Henderson, Lenora	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/29/2020, Alicia Clemmons

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

638

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

3

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

3

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	158	162	165	144	629
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	10	11	10	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	39	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	43	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	39	0	0	77

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	0	0	0	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

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	180	176	150	134	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	11	12	10	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	25	25	125

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	0	0	0	

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	

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	180	176	150	134	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	11	12	10	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	25	25	125

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 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				50%	48%	56%	51%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	46%	51%	52%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	32%	42%	52%	45%	44%
Math Achievement				45%	41%	51%	44%	37%	51%
Math Learning Gains				44%	45%	48%	43%	38%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	38%	45%	30%	30%	45%
Science Achievement				67%	70%	68%	69%	60%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				61%	67%	73%	64%	60%	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	51%	47%	4%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	48%	47%	1%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

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	68%	67%	1%	67%	1%

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	62%	65%	-3%	70%	-8%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	28%	49%	-21%	61%	-33%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	55%	49%	6%	57%	-2%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM)-All students in grades 9-10

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	25	24	18	25	19	24	39	22		95	53
BLK	31	25	17	10	17	25	38	62		100	60
HSP	57	55		50							
MUL	38	27		36							
WHT	55	45	42	42	22	28	65	65		92	85

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
FRL	42	42	30	28	20	16	54	60		92	70
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	24	27	27	23	37	35	58	60		80	50
BLK	40	36	38	42	42	30	43	21		88	57
WHT	52	49	35	45	45	28	72	68		91	76
FRL	46	46	45	39	42	33	55	53		87	66
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	20	32	37	25	28	20	38	17		78	7
BLK	44	48	36	28	39	33	36	36		78	39
MUL	54	58		20	30						
WHT	52	52	58	50	45	31	74	66		92	63
FRL	44	49	44	38	39	38	48	46		79	39

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
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	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

9th grade FSA-ELA proficiency scores decreased (51% in 2019 to 49% in 2021)
 10th grade FSA-ELA proficiency scores increased (48% in 2019 to 51% in 2021)
 Algebra EOC proficiency score was 14% compared to the state average(30%)

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

Based on 2020-2021 Progress Monitoring (APM) results, multi-racial students in 10th grade scored the lowest, and American Indian/Alaskan scored the lowest in 9th grade.

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

The factor(s) that contributed to this decline in math proficiency include a need for professional development on backwards design, ongoing classroom level formative assessments designed to inform teachers on next steps for instruction.

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

10th grade FSA-ELA proficiency scores increased (48% in 2019 to 51% in 2021).

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

Contributing factors include an ongoing emphasis on WICOR, and data driven (formative and summative) instruction to guide next steps in the instructional process.

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

New actions include an ongoing emphasis on WICOR, and data driven (formative and summative) instruction to guide next steps in the instructional process.

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.

Ongoing B.E.S.T Standards training (ELA and Math), Curriculum Review (math) in preparation for math curriculum adoption 2022-2023 school year.

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

1. Intensive Reading classes available for all level 1,2 students.
2. Intensive Math classes for all level 1,2 students.
3. MTSS
4. Professional Development (Backwards design, Data analysis, B.E.S.T Standards for Math/ELA).
5. School-wide culture, (access and equity for all students, growth mindset, WICOR, ELA Expectations (EE's)
6. Progress Monitoring (APM)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math percentile proficiency (14) compared to the state average (30). The area of focus is targeted based on the prior year needs assessment/analysis results.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will score at or above the state average on the Algebra EOC during the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing progress monitoring results, classroom achievement, and ongoing administration walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide emphasis on WICOR, RIGOR, MTR's Math Remediation Course MTSS, to include targeted interventions in math for struggling students After-school tutoring program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies are data informed and instructional resources used are research based.

Action Steps to Implement

Intensive reading classes provided for all level 1,2 struggling students.
 Professional development: backwards design, B.E.S.T math standards
 Professional development: data driven instruction (formative and summative)
 School-wide emphasis on access and equity, and growth mindset, MTR's

Person Responsible Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	9th grade ELA proficiency for 2021 (49) compared to the state average (50). The area of focus is targeted based on the prior year needs assessment/analysis results
Measurable Outcome:	Students in 9th grade will score at or above the state proficiency average during the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing progress monitoring results, classroom achievement, and ongoing administration walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide emphasis on WICOR, RIGOR, EE's Reading Remediation Course MTSS, to include targeted interventions in reading for struggling students After-school tutoring program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies are data informed and instructional resources used are research based.

Action Steps to Implement

Intensive reading classes provided for all level 1,2 struggling students.

Professional development: B.E.S.T ELA standards

Professional development: data driven instruction (formative and summative)

School-wide emphasis on access and equity, and growth mindset, EE's

Person Responsible Alicia Clemmons (alicia.clemmons@wcsdschools.com)

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.

Chipley High School will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities by placing a strong emphasis on School Safety, WICOR strategies, RIGOR, equity and access for all students, Students progress will be monitored using classroom and state level progress monitoring results, and administrative walkthrough/evaluation observation cycles

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.

CHS strives to build relationships with local community partners to share responsibility in obtaining resources and support for clubs, activities, and various educational initiatives.

CHS students are recognized for academic achievements by local businesses and partnerships with community based organizations.

Community Partner Programs Include: Take Stock in Children, a Plethora of educational scholarships, and College and Career Readiness resources and support.

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

Stakeholders include administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders, and elected officials such as school board members, city council members, etc.

CHS strives to build relationships with local community partners to share responsibility in obtaining resources and support for clubs, activities, and various educational initiatives. Students are recognized for academic achievements by local businesses and partnerships with community based organizations.

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
Total:			\$0.00