

Hendry County Schools

Clewiston High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clewiston High School

1501 S FRANCISCO ST, Clewiston, FL 33440

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Summers, Phillip	Principal	
Llossas, Sherrie	Assistant Principal	
Stone, Ian	Assistant Principal	
Rindone, Carmelo	Dean	
Roberts, Tori	Instructional Coach	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Organizational Leadership Team Meeting and review of prior year. Faculty Meetings (monthly), PLCs (weekly), School Advisory Council (monthly), Leadership Team Meetings (bi-monthly)

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

At the end of each quarter, the Leadership Team will revisit the SIP and revise as necessary.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	35	50	39	39	51	40		
ELA Learning Gains				40			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			34		
Math Achievement*	22	22	38	18	33	38	25		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				22			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				18			41		
Science Achievement*	50	56	64	54	28	40	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	62	66	46	36	48	65		
Middle School Acceleration					51	44			
Graduation Rate	87	86	89	87	59	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	53	64	65	62	62	67	47		
ELP Progress	41	37	45	40			32		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	87

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	11

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	85
Graduation Rate	87

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	37			22			50	53		87	53	41
SWD	22			14			24	21		13	6	
ELL	16			12			39	38		38	7	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			18			35	35		45	6	
HSP	40			23			56	57		57	7	39
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	31			19			56	71		52	6	
FRL	34			21			48	51		50	7	47

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	39	40	33	18	22	18	54	46		87	62	40
SWD	17	23	17	25			37	50		84	22	
ELL	19	36	32	14			32	34		74	62	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	38	33	12	10		47	33		91	56	
HSP	40	43	38	30	24		62	54		84	61	41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	33	15	24	25		65	61		88	71	
FRL	35	41	32	24	18	10	56	50		87	62	27

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	43	34	25	27	41	68	65		91	47	32
SWD	28	42	27	29	18			41		80	18	
ELL	10	31	26	37	44	45	50	41		77	71	32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	28	36	7	9		70	47		98	21	
HSP	42	45	33	29	33	52	65	70		87	51	32
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	49		32	26		80	64		91	65	
FRL	37	42	38	24	32	50	67	63		90	43	27

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	36%	37%	-1%	50%	-14%
09	2023 - Spring	36%	40%	-4%	48%	-12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	32%	-10%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	22%	1%	48%	-25%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	63%	-16%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	63%	-12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math (Algebra 1 and Geometry) had the lowest performance at 22 percent proficiency in both parts. Math teacher left mid-year and the coach had to move into the classroom; which decreased the support in all math classrooms. Lack of consistent progress monitoring used with fidelity throughout the year. Overall teacher attendance was also a contributing factor.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Biology showed a decrease of 12 points in achievement from years 22 to 23. In 23 we increased the enrolled number of students in Biology due to changes in course progressions. To accommodate this, two additional teachers were moved from other science areas to teach Biology that had not previously taught the course.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Algebra 1 was 31 points below the state average. There was a lack of consistent progress monitoring used with fidelity throughout the year. Missing consistent support inside and outside the Algebra classrooms.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math overall showed a 4 point growth from years 22 to 23. A new curriculum was introduced in both Algebra 1 and Geometry. Teachers made use of collaborative planning structures during the school day.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

In both ELA and Math we have a high level of students who are not proficient and also achieving a level 1.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Increase teacher proficiency in standards-based planning and instruction.

Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers in research-based instructional strategies, with a focus on AVID, and monitor their implementation and outcomes.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To improve teacher retention and recruitment, evidence-based interventions include creating a positive and supportive work environment, providing professional development opportunities, implementing mentorship programs for new teachers, and fostering strong teacher-administrator relationships. These interventions have shown to be effective in attracting and retaining teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Specific measurable outcomes for improving school culture in relation to teacher retention and recruitment could include:

1. Increase in teacher retention rate by 5% over the next academic year.
2. Increase in the number of qualified applicants for teaching positions by 10%.
3. Increase in teacher satisfaction survey scores by 1 points/20% on a scale of 1-5.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Distribute intent to return form in March and compare to prior year's actual teacher retention.
2. Weekly monitoring of Frontline.
3. Send out baseline survey, midyear and end of year surveys to compare data and adjust practices if needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ian Stone (stonei@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Formation of a school-wide teacher led committee focusing on school-wide culture. Committee's goals will consist of: Increasing staff recognition/celebrations, increasing opportunities for staff to have positive interactions with students and school stakeholders.
2. Increasing Professional Learning opportunities based on staff needs survey.
3. Increasing staff leadership opportunities through the formation of staff led committee's and staff led Professional Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Empowering teachers through leadership opportunities and fostering their professional growth creates personal investment and increases the likelihood of retention. As staff is maintained and continue to grow professional relationships, the overall culture and climate of our instructional team will continue to improve at Clewiston High School.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Culture Committee

- A survey will be sent to staff to collect interest in participation
- Administration will meet with those staff for the initial meeting to organize the members and establish supports
- The committee will meet regularly, create an action plan to address the goals of the committee, and report out during leadership meetings weekly

Person Responsible: Ian Stone (stonei@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 5th, 2023

Professional Learning Opportunities

- An instructional needs survey will be sent to staff and reviewed by the leadership team
- The professional learning team will connect AVID strategies to those areas of need and create a professional learning plan
- Staff will be identified to support or lead the professional learning opportunities

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

By When: September 1st - Needs Survey Professional Learning Opportunities - Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the increasing number of student subgroups falling below the federal index, we will focus on increasing student engagement in all classrooms through the implementation of AVID strategies school wide. This will include AVID Advisory, with an intensive focus on WICOR strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

50% of teachers will be observed utilizing an AVID strategy by September 2023. 70% of teachers will be observed utilizing an AVID strategy by November 2023. 100% of teachers will be observed utilizing an AVID strategy by January 2024.

FAST ELA proficiency on PM3 will improve to 45 percent and Math proficiency will improve to 35 percent.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The implementation of AVID strategies will be monitored by weekly walkthroughs by administration. Feedback will be provided to teachers following the walkthroughs in order to maintain consistency and fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Phillip Summers (summersp@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is an evidence-based intervention that focuses on equipping students with the skills and support they need to succeed in college and beyond. AVID utilizes research-based strategies such as inquiry-based learning, collaborative study groups, and organizational tools to enhance student learning and academic achievement. By implementing AVID, Clewiston High School will provide targeted support for underrepresented students, promote college readiness, and foster a positive and inclusive learning environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID has been extensively researched and has shown positive outcomes in terms of improving student achievement, college readiness, and creating a supportive learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create AVID PL Plan

- Identify strategies for implementation
- Create a calendar of AVID PL opportunities
- Build/present AVID PLs

Person Responsible: Ian Stone (stonei@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Create Calendar - September 5th, 2023 AVID PLs - Monthly (or more), ongoing

AVID Instructional Rounds

- Identify staff to model AVID strategies from PL
- Create calendar for rounds
- Conduct instruction rounds and debriefs

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

By When: Identify Staff/Create Calendar - September 5th, 2023 Instructional Rounds - Monthly (or more), ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).