

Hendry County Schools

Clewiston 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

Clewiston High School

1501 S FRANCISCO ST, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=4&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Phillip Summers

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2021

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	No
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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 Hendry 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	0

Clewiston High School

1501 S FRANCISCO ST, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=4&sc_id=1171294169

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;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">85%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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.

Clewiston High will ensure that all students make academic gains in a safe environment that encourages students to take on academic challenges with support in pursuit of them becoming well-rounded and productive citizens of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage, Inspire, and Challenge, every student, every day.

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
Summers, Phillip	Principal	
Parantha , Reko	Assistant Principal	
Llossas, Sherrie	Administrative Support	Collegiate Administrator
Stone, Ian	Dean	
Perez, Rosa	Reading Coach	
Rindone, Carmelo	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Tori		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/24/2021, Phillip Summers

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

996

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

6

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

5

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	228	273	250	241	992
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	69	55	56	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	70	80	93	315
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	92	60	53	270
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	119	85	78	338
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	86	63	64	266
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	73	104	86	95	358

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	263	240	232	255	990
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	68	68	66	276
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	34	46	36	160
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	22	10	35	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	64	71	84	324
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	65	65	57	276

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	98	70	76	81	325

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	0	12

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	263	240	232	255	990
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	68	68	66	276
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	34	46	36	160
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	22	10	35	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	64	71	84	324
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	65	65	57	276

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	98	70	76	81	325

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	0	12

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				42%	43%	56%	40%	42%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	47%	51%	41%	45%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	35%	42%	37%	36%	44%
Math Achievement				27%	32%	51%	27%	30%	51%
Math Learning Gains				37%	49%	48%	40%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	47%	45%	54%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				57%	72%	68%	85%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	66%	73%	63%	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	42%	44%	-2%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	37%	38%	-1%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
		-42%				

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	54%	65%	-11%	67%	-13%
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	68%	62%	6%	70%	-2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	38%	-11%	61%	-34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	23%	40%	-17%	57%	-34%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- ELA - iReady
- Math - Albert.io, Study Island
- Biology - Study Island
- US History - Teacher created

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		25	
	Economically Disadvantaged		23	
	Students With Disabilities		8	
	English Language Learners		0	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		24	
	Economically Disadvantaged		10	
	Students With Disabilities		17	
	English Language Learners		1	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		n/a	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		n/a	
	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	28	42	27	29	18			41		80	18
ELL	10	31	26	37	44	45	50	41		77	71
BLK	21	28	36	7	9		70	47		98	21
HSP	42	45	33	29	33	52	65	70		87	51
WHT	55	49		32	26		80	64		91	65

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	37	42	38	24	32	50	67	63		90	43
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	18	37	22	22	50		36	39		84	19
ELL	23	30	28	32	50		50	64		33	
BLK	34	39	26	17	34	25	41	60		82	39
HSP	40	44	36	27	33	26	63	72		76	59
WHT	57	55	36	41	59		63	81		94	63
FRL	39	43	34	28	36	33	53	70		78	48
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	14	20	15	16	30		64	45		88	13
ELL	22	23	10	41	55					39	
BLK	30	39	47	15	25		70	47		96	11
HSP	39	40	31	31	44	64	85	68		81	61
WHT	53	45		31	42		97	64		94	59
FRL	37	41	37	25	39	55	83	60		87	43

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	84%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	37
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	49
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	58
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	47
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?

Students with disabilities and African American students performed below the Federal Index.

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

Algebra 1 and Geometry

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

Loss of classroom instructional time due to COVID (distance learning) has contributed. Using iXL for baselines and 3 benchmark testing. The data will be utilized throughout the year to adjust instruction in order to meet the needs of our lowest performing students.

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

Based on the state assessment, US History showed the most improvement.

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

Standards-based planning and teacher created progress monitoring of assessments.

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

WICOR strategies, Literacy focus and PLCs with common planning. Progress monitoring is improving school-wide.

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.

We are using the above programs for progress monitoring. -
 BEST, Achieve3000, MaxScholar
 Math - iXL
 Science - Penda
 Social Studies - Edulastic

Data-driven PLC process is being implemented with fidelity. Teachers are provided professional development on WICOR strategies that will be implemented school wide.

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

Continued and ongoing training and PD in the new Florida BEST standards in ELA and math. We will continue collaborative planning in which standards will be unpacked and their will be an alignment between learning targets and student task. We will continue to send teachers to the AVID training.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 20-21 school year, ELA proficiency was at 40% according to our FSA data. There was a 2% decrease from the 18-19 data.
Measurable Outcome:	Scores will increase by 7%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will be done several times throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID/WICOR
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	An article published in the Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, by Watt, Powell, Mendiola, and Cossio (2006) examined high schools in Texas that used AVID as a model for comprehensive school reform. AVID schools in this study saw an improvement in areas of advanced course enrollment, students graduating with advanced graduation plans, AP/IB testing, and high school graduation or completion rates over the four-year period. Their districts also experienced gains in all four areas. Non-AVID schools experienced gains in students graduating on advanced graduation plans and AP/IB testing, and their districts followed the same pattern.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide implementation on AVID strategies.
2. Curriculum map based on ELA BEST standards.
3. Extreme Reading for the bottom 25% of 9th graders.
4. Achieve 3000 in Intensive Reading classes (9th/10th).
5. Progress monitoring with iReady twice a year.

Person Responsible Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Proficiency rate according to the FSA 20-21 school year was 25%. This is a drop of 2% from the 18-19 school year using the same data.

Measurable Outcome: Mathematics will increase the proficiency by 7% over Algebra 1 and Geometry.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring will be done using iXL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID/WICOR

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: An article published in the Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, by Watt, Powell, Mendiola, and Cossio (2006) examined high schools in Texas that used AVID as a model for comprehensive school reform. AVID schools in this study saw an improvement in areas of advanced course enrollment, students graduating with advanced graduation plans, AP/IB testing, and high school graduation or completion rates over the four-year period. Their districts also experienced gains in all four areas. Non-AVID schools experienced gains in students graduating on advanced graduation plans and AP/IB testing, and their districts followed the same pattern.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide implementation on AVID strategies.
2. Curriculum map.
3. Continuous Progress Monitoring throughout the year using iXL.

Person Responsible: Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: According to the Federal Index, Black/African-American students were at 40% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: There will be a 3% increase for the 21-22 school year.

Monitoring: Progress Monitoring for ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID/WICOR

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: An article published in the Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, by Watt, Powell, Mendiola, and Cossio (2006) examined high schools in Texas that used AVID as a model for comprehensive school reform. AVID schools in this study saw an improvement in areas of advanced course enrollment, students graduating with advanced graduation plans, AP/IB testing, and high school graduation or completion rates over the four-year period. Their districts also experienced gains in all four areas. Non-AVID schools experienced gains in students graduating on advanced graduation plans and AP/IB testing, and their districts followed the same pattern.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide implementation on AVID strategies.
2. Curriculum map based on BEST standards for ELA and Math.
3. Extreme Reading for the bottom 25% of 9th graders.
4. Achieve 3000 in Intensive Reading classes (9th/10th).
5. Progress monitoring with iReady twice a year.

Person Responsible: Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the FSA data for the 20-21 school year, students with disabilities were 36% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency will increase by 6%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring for ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Reko Parantha (paranthar@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID/WICOR
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	An article published in the Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, by Watt, Powell, Mendiola, and Cossio (2006) examined high schools in Texas that used AVID as a model for comprehensive school reform. AVID schools in this study saw an improvement in areas of advanced course enrollment, students graduating with advanced graduation plans, AP/IB testing, and high school graduation or completion rates over the four-year period. Their districts also experienced gains in all four areas. Non-AVID schools experienced gains in students graduating on advanced graduation plans and AP/IB testing, and their districts followed the same pattern.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide implementation on AVID strategies.
2. Curriculum map based on BEST standards for ELA and Math.
3. Extreme Reading for the bottom 25% of 9th graders.
4. Achieve 3000 in Intensive Reading classes (9th/10th).
5. Progress monitoring with iReady twice a year.

Person Responsible Reko Parantha (paranthar@hendry-schools.net)

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.

CHS has been decreasing in the number of in-school and out of school suspension since the 18-19 school year. We will continue to decrease in each of these areas through the continued implementation of PBIS.

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.

1. Focus on investing in people and building relationships
2. Continue to have a consistent, shared vision for our school.
3. Administrators will continue to be positive role models for our students.
4. Continue to praise appropriately and celebrate victories.

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

Administrators, Coaches, Faculty and Support Staff - build relationships with students by being a positive role model, setting the tone with high expectations and having a shared vision.