Choctawhatchee Senior High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Choctawhatchee Senior High School

110 RACETRACK RD NW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Heck

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2021-22 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Okaloosa 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

Choctawhatchee Senior High School

110 RACETRACK RD NW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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.

We prepare all students to achieve excellence by providing the highest quality education while empowering each individual to positively impact their families, communities, and the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We inspire a lifelong passion for learning for all students and stakeholders.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Heck, Michelle	Principal	Administrative Evaluations, teacher evaluations, budget, crisis plan, ESE compliance, personnel, Public Relations, School Oversight, Leadership Team Facilitator, Special Projects, Threat Assessment Team
Lanpher, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Accreditation, Curriculum, FTE Oversight, IB Coordinator, Guidance Department, Master Schedule, MTSS, Registration, Teacher and Ed Support Evaluations
Donaldson, Brandon	Assistant Principal	9th Grade Team Leader, 11th and 12th Grade Discipline, Graduation, Student Training Program, Summer School, Teacher and Support Staff Evaluations
Beasley, Jennifer	Administrative Support	AP Program Coordinator, Attendance and Truancy, Equitable Committee, FLDOE Accountability, FTE Attendance, SAC Facilitator, School Performance Plan

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/10/2022, Michelle Heck

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

89

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,789

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

18

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

18

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	550	478	369	329	1726
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	77	46	49	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	19	12	7	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	33	13	12	89
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	46	28	36	146
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	78	53	0	261
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	57	51	20	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	78	53	0	261

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	161	117	71	24	373

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	73	58	21	3	155
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	1	0	28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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	572	424	368	338	1702
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	15	12	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	3	4	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	156	87	66	462
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	177	95	56	509
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	60	50	41	247
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	19	1	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	60	50	41	152
	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	8	11	6	4	29

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	90	88	34	30	242
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	101	70	40	331

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	572	424	368	338	1702
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	15	12	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	3	4	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	156	87	66	462
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	177	95	56	509
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	60	50	41	247
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	19	1	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	60	50	41	152
	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	8	11	6	4	29

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	90	88	34	30	242
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	101	70	40	331

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	58%	51%				59%	70%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						50%	55%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						45%	48%	42%
Math Achievement	50%	40%	38%				61%	72%	51%
Math Learning Gains	55%						46%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						42%	47%	45%
Science Achievement	68%	59%	40%				74%	75%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	57%	48%				76%	85%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	72%	71%	1%	67%	5%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	79%	-5%	70%	4%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	45%	77%	-32%	61%	-16%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	67%	73%	-6%	57%	10%

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	26	43	36	40	48	36	48	65		85	20
ELL	7	35	41	26	58	60	33	40		74	8
ASN	56	59					91			92	64
BLK	46	49	52	38	44	42	57	62		90	50
HSP	35	45	42	39	57	58	46	57		86	42
MUL	45	45	53	57	67	58	71	63		93	64
WHT	56	46	42	54	55	46	75	76		92	62
FRL	45	50	47	47	54	47	59	65		86	48

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	31	42	32	37	33	34	49	54		88	52
ELL	17	42	39	16	14	23	28	21		74	7
ASN	69	73		50	30					100	73
BLK	47	39	29	33	19	14	52	65		89	48
HSP	37	44	36	26	25	31	46	43		90	48
MUL	45	43	38	37	32		61	65		100	55
WHT	57	47	38	51	31	29	72	84		96	78
FRL	43	40	36	37	30	24	50	61		92	59

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	35	36	34	43	44	50	57	54		95	38
ELL	20	41	36	31	29	44	36			61	36
ASN	64	55		50	25		75	92		92	92
BLK	43	44	53	50	38	46	65	53		85	43
HSP	45	51	43	46	48	45	67	61		85	64
MUL	50	38	50	60	44	42	73	85		100	60
WHT	68	53	43	67	49	41	78	82		96	71
FRL	48	46	43	53	47	43	62	66		89	54

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	60
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Although we saw a drop in our overall ELA Achievement level, we saw improvement in Learning Gains and LG of Lowest 25%. Math and Social Studies saw increases in all components.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that shows the greatest need is ELL ELA. We showed a decrease in Achievement as well as in ELA LG.

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

As our ELL population continues to grow, we have added additional ELL teachers to address their needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math Achievement and Learning gains showed marked improvements in both components.

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

Bi-monthly Geometry and Algebra Teachers collaboration meetings with our district Math Program Specialist helped align math curriculum and instruction which contributed to the improvements.

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

We will be offering targeted after school tutoring for Math and ELA as well as targeted tutoring for our ELL students with interpreters. Monthly parent meetings for ELL parents and students have been scheduled to inform parents about programs that our school offers.

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.

Monthly PD for all teachers in lesson design, highlighting research based instructional strategies. Monthly department meetings with content specific PD.

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

Bi-monthly meetings with ELA and Math teachers are scheduled for collaboration and data analysis and needs assessment to plan for lessons. After school tutoring will continue.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	ELL Students represent a rapidly growing subgroup within our school and community. Achievement data shows the greatest need in ELA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	At least 55% of ELL Students will show Learning Gains in ELA and 60% Learning Gains as evidenced by state assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monthly progress monitoring will occur using Achieve 300 and IXL data with school leadership and individual teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Beasley (jennifer.beasley@okaloosaschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Content area vocabulary, text- marking, mentor sentence frames and Universal Design for Learning approaches will be implemented across the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Content Area Vocabulary is critical for decoding content, students benefit from the use of sentence frame while they acquire a new language. These strategies are detailed in The Universal Design for Learning.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

A school based committee will review and update ELL Plans with targeted instructional strategies to support English Language Acquisition and proficiency level.

Person Responsible	Ryan Lanpher (ryan.lanpher@okaloosaschools.com)

Teachers will utilize Focus to access updated ELL Student Plans with embedded correlations to WIDA Can Do descriptors to inform placement and instruction.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Beasley (jennifer.beasley@okaloosaschools.com)

Duolingo for Schools will be used as a supplemental resource to support language acquisition in speaking, writing, reading and listening domains for students in WIDA Tiers A and B.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Beasley (jennifer.beasley@okaloosaschools.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

As a school, we will continue to foster a positive school culture and environment. Staff meets weekly to collaborate, plan and work together to foster our foundation of relationships. Our students' voices are an integral part of the school culture with representation on SAC as well as school leadership meeting with the student governing body monthly.

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

Our community, students, staff and families are all vital members of our stakeholders who share a common goal of continuously "growing" and improving our school. They all contribute to our culture with weekly communication as an pillar of our culture. Vertical alignment with our feeder schools helps to foster a sense of community and a seamless transition for our Freshmen.