

Leon County Schools

Lawton Chiles High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lawton Chiles High School

7200 LAWTON CHILES LN, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/chiles>

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Leon 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Lawton Chiles High School is building a tradition of excellence by providing an environment where students are challenged to be active learners, leaders, achievers and contributors within a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement

Lawton Chiles High School will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

Our Principles:

The structure and curriculum of Lawton Chiles High School is based upon many strong beliefs. Among the top principles are those which stakeholders feel are paramount to student success.

They are as follows:

- Education is a life-long process.
- Students maximize performance by developing self-discipline and effective critical thinking, academic and leadership skills.
- Diversity can enhance students' understanding of all people and cultures.
- Students should be active learners and have ownership of their learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burgess, Joseph	Principal	
Pickens, Calli	Assistant Principal	
Lightfoot, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Swope, John	Assistant Principal	
Tekel, Paige	Teacher, ESE	
Thai, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	
Layton, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Benton, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor	
Taylor, Jenny	Other	
Hampton, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Buchanan, Buck	Teacher, K-12	
Pierce, Heather	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Joseph Burgess

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

117

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%

<p>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)</p>	<p>Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (70%)</p>
<p>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</p>	
<p>SI Region</p>	<p>Northwest</p>
<p>Regional Executive Director</p>	<p>Jeff Sewell</p>
<p>Turnaround Option/Cycle</p>	
<p>Year</p>	
<p>Support Tier</p>	<p>NOT IN DA</p>
<p>ESSA Status</p>	
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	514	586	517	471	2088
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	12	14	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	16	13	12	77
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	6	3	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	16	8	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	39	33	24	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	19	13	4	64
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	19	10	10	75

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	6	5	14	2	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - 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	513	586	520	470	2089
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	53	45	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	27	32	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	44	37	24	146

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	11	18	18	14	61

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - 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	583	586	520	470	2159
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	53	45	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	27	32	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	44	37	24	146

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	11	18	18	14	61

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	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	80%	57%	56%	79%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	52%	51%	62%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	40%	42%	49%	37%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	77%	56%	51%	74%	52%	51%
Math Learning Gains	49%	47%	48%	46%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	47%	45%	56%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	90%	67%	68%	81%	64%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	82%	73%	90%	77%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	81%	58%	23%	55%	26%
	2018	82%	60%	22%	53%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	79%	57%	22%	53%	26%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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
2019	90%	70%	20%	67%	23%
2018	81%	69%	12%	65%	16%
Compare		9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	81%	5%	70%	16%
2018	89%	79%	10%	68%	21%
Compare		-3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	69%	-10%	61%	-2%
2018	66%	71%	-5%	62%	4%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	67%	18%	57%	28%
2018	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
Compare		8%			

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	38	37	52	63	64	55	71		95	26
ASN	87	67	20	86	62		89			100	92
BLK	59	58	44	54	32	57	71	66		98	45
HSP	76	51	45	67	53	69	87	93		95	68
MUL	82	58	60	79	44		88			100	63
WHT	82	61	51	80	51	70	93	88		100	65
FRL	62	48	43	60	44	48	68	69		98	29

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	32	43	40	42	42	50	50	50		84	26
ASN	96	84		81	54		100	91		97	86
BLK	53	53	45	50	36	42	54	83		94	52
HSP	78	65	57	70	36		86			84	56
MUL	62	42		53	42		55			100	46

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	81	62	50	79	47	60	84	90		99	67
FRL	56	50	46	54	55	67	64	77		89	39

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	722
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	75
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	58
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	70
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	74
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Chiles High School had two data components that performed at the lowest percent of 49%. First, our Math Learning Gains, but it is an upward trend from 2018 at 46%.

Secondly, our English Language Arts Learning Gains for the lowest 25% was at 49% for the second year in a row.

This seems to be a trend and the school is implementing strategies and improvements to increase learning gains for our bottom 25%. This is a school focus for the 2020-21 school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year of 2018-19/ 2019-20 is the Social Studies Achievement score. In 2018, 90% of the students who took the United States History End of Course Exam passed with an Achievement Level of 3 to 5.

As the number of students who are taking AP United States History is increasing within our student population, the number of students enrolled in U.S. History general decreases. The average reading level for our general courses is an Achievement Level of 2. Our ELA and Social Studies departments are working to integrate more reading in the content strategies to assist our struggling readers in areas such as vocabulary focus, data chats, and progress monitoring.

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

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Achievement and Math Achievement. The Math Achievement for Chiles was 77% and the state average was 51%. That shows a difference of 26 percentage points. The ELA Achievement for Chiles was 80% and the state average was 56%. That shows a difference of 24 percentage points.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Math of the Lowest 25th Percentile that increased from 56% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. Chiles High School took on the focus of looking and working with our lowest 25% of students. For the upcoming year, we will continue our progress monitoring system with data chats and remediation of those standards that students are not mastering.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two potential areas of concern for Lawton Chiles High School would be our percentage of students who were Level 1 on statewide assessments and students who have attendance below 90%.

*Students with an IEP will meet with their case managers to assist with learning strategies to support classes and prepare for EOCs.

*Students with an IEP who take the Unique Skills resource class will develop study strategies and take practice tests to review areas where improvement is needed .

*Teachers will encourage students to take honors and AP classes to foster a sense of self confidence and success.

*All faculty members, staff, club sponsors, and coaches will encourage regular attendance by meeting with students and holding them accountable for being present at school.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains for the bottom 25%
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Percent of Subgroups in Acceleration classes
4. Students with attendance below 90%
5. ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the percentage of students in the area of Social Studies Achievement. We have a decrease in our overall percentage of students receiving achievement levels 3-5 on the United States History EOC. As our number of students historically receiving an achievement level of 1 or 2 on the FSA ELA increases it will affect the United States History EOC. Also, as our number of students who are enrolled in AP US History increases, the number of high achieving students in United States History decreases.

Measureable Outcome: As we use a more complex state measure of history, our school goal is to have at least 78% of our students proficient in this area on the 2020 US History End of Course Exam scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS for FSA ELA (10th grade scores) when the Sept/Oct make-up test scores are returned to the school. (At the beginning of the school year they can access their 9th grade FSA scores.) The teachers will determine the specific areas of concern through curriculum and reading strategies that are designed to help students improve.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be involved in department and district professional development activities that support the area of reading in the content area.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will identify struggling students based on the bottom 25% data and FSA ELA scores.

Person Responsible Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use progress monitoring mid-year and the diagnostic to target standards needed to be retaught.

Person Responsible Oscar Brennan (brennano@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use the content pacing guide and EOC review. ESE Case Managers support students with EOC reviews and practice tests.

Person Responsible Oscar Brennan (brennano@leonschools.net)

Teachers can implement content area vocabulary to assist with reading comprehension.

Person Responsible Oscar Brennan (brennano@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the percentage of students in the areas of Algebra I. We have a number of students who historically achieve low grades in their math courses. These students don't have the prior knowledge required to receive a proficient score on the Algebra I EOC. We have a number of high achieving students who complete Algebra I and the subsequent EOC in middle school. Because these students' scores are not included in our overall scores, it is difficult to improve the percentage of proficiency.

Measureable Outcome: As we use a more complex state measure of math, our school goal is to have at least 55% of our students proficient in this area on the 2021 Algebra I End of Course Exam scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use the data to modify their instruction in our Algebra I classes. Standards that they pinpoint as failing will be retaught through classroom instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use progress monitoring mid-term.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use the district pacing guide and curriculum map.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use the district Algebra I EOC End of Course Review.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

Teachers and the department head will review progress monitoring data to gear instruction.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

ESE Case Managers will support students by providing supplementary lessons to assist with Algebra I skills.

Person Responsible Amanda Thai (thaia@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the percentage of students in the area of Geometry. We have a number of students who historically achieve low grades in their math courses. These students lack prior knowledge required to receive a proficient score on the Geometry EOC. We have a number of high achieving students who completed Algebra I and Geometry and the subsequent EOC in middle school.

Measureable Outcome: As we use a more complex state measure of math, our school goal is to have at least 70% of our students our students proficient in this area on the 2021 Geometry End of Course Exam (EOC) scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will closely monitor those students who are in Geometry that have yet to pass the Algebra 1 EOC as that is a requirement for graduation.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use the course pacing guide and curriculum map.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

Teachers will progress monitor their students twice a year.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use data chats with students.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

ESE Case Managers will supplement Geometry lessons with prior skills.

Person Responsible Amanda Thai (thaia@leonschools.net)

EOC practice tests will be given to determine areas of need and improvement.

Person Responsible Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the percentage of students in the area of English/Reading/Writing. Historically, we have a number of students who are in honors level classes who score a level 2 or 3 on the FSA ELA 9th and 10th grade assessments. These students are difficult to progress to the next level of proficiency. We have a number of students who consistently score a level 4 or 5 on the FSA. These students have difficulty maintaining the high level with the progressive difficulty of the ELA FSA exam.

Measureable Outcome: As we use a more complex state measure of English/Language Arts, our school goal is to have at least 72% of our students proficient in this area on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will address their concerns through curriculum and reading strategies that are designed to help the students improve. Teachers are involved in professional development activities including reading endorsement classes that support the area of reading.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will identify students below proficiency level and their students included in the bottom 25%.

Person Responsible Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use progress monitoring twice a year.

Person Responsible Andrew Shoenberger (shoenbergera@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use data charts to inform students of their progress.

Person Responsible Andrew Shoenberger (shoenbergera@leonschools.net)

ESE teachers will supplement ELA lessons with vocabulary, writing, grammar, and comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible Amanda Thai (thaia@leonschools.net)

Students will take regular practice tests and review areas that need improvement.

Person Responsible Andrew Shoenberger (shoenbergera@leonschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the percentage of students in the area of Biology. We have a number of students who score a level of 2 or 3 on the FSA. These students have difficulty with the reading required to receive a proficient scorer on the Biology EOC. WE have a number of high achieving students who completed high school biology and the subsequent EOC in middle school. Because these students' scores are not included in our overall scores, it is difficult to improve the percentage of proficiency,

Measureable Outcome: As we use a more complex state measure of science, our school goal is to have at least 75% of our students proficient in this area on the 2021 Biology 1 End of Course Exam.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will address their concerns in these areas through curriculum and reading strategies that are designed to help the students improve.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use the district progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Bonni Warren (warrenb@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use the district pacing guide and curriculum map.

Person Responsible Bonni Warren (warrenb@leonschools.net)

Students will use review guides to track the content learned.

Person Responsible Bonni Warren (warrenb@leonschools.net)

ESE teachers will review material to take practice tests in Unique Skills.

Person Responsible Amanda Thai (thaia@leonschools.net)

Teachers will complete content chats to support students with areas in which they need additional support.

Person Responsible Bonni Warren (warrenb@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Teachers will access their student data scores at the beginning of the year to identify our bottom 25% in both Math and ELA. Both Math and ELA will use data chats, progress monitoring, and reading strategies to improve instruction for our bottom 25%. Guidance, our testing coordinator, Dean and Assistant Principals will work and mentor students. Students who have attendance problems, discipline issues, and/or are Level 1 on state assessments will be continuously monitored through our Student Affairs department.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We are not a Title I school, but we support and encourage a positive school culture and environment. We want to always encourage learning condition that meet the needs of all students. Chiles has high expectations for all students and values all cultures. Chiles High School has a very active Parent/Teacher Organization (PTO). The Chiles High School PTO provides many volunteer hours each year. These hours are logged as assisting at student recognition events, club events, and athletic events. Chiles communicates with stakeholders through social media, listserv and FOCUS. We use apps to send quick reminders of current and upcoming events. Listservs are used to communicate more lengthy information. FOCUS is a resource and means of communication used to update parents on grades and progress a student is making.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.