# Countryside High School



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Countryside High School

### 3000 STATE ROAD 580, Clearwater, FL 33761

### http://www.countryside-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us/

**Demographics**

## Principal: Robert Vicari

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | High School PK, 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) | *[Data Not Available]* |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

* 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 Pinellas 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.](http://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.**

At Countryside High School, success is our goal. We will provide the tools and instruction needed for the success of all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Countryside High School is that teachers will provide the opportunity for all students to be successful learners and to become active participants in our society by creating a safe learning environment and building positive relationships.

### 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 |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Henderson, Taylor | Principal | Responsible for providing mission, vision, and all site management duties. |
| Alexander, Lonnette | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for AP College Board / Mathematics/ESE/MTSS/CST/Transportation/ Instructional Materials |
| Bernstein, Brad | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Curriculum / Social Science / iSTEM Application Program Coordinator |
| Overall, Erin | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Activities and Athletics / Science |
| Ramos-Gonzalez, Cynthia | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Facilities / State Testing / English Language Arts / ESOL / World Languages |
| Prince, Kerrale | Curriculum Resource Teacher | AVID Site Coordinator |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Robert Vicari

**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.*

3

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

71

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,831

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

11

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

11

**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 | 510 | 489 | 433 | 380 | 1812 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 53 | 29 | 27 | 130 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 38 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 61 | 53 | 6 | 173 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 182 | 170 | 12 | 523 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 94 | 82 | 43 | 314 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 81 | 56 | 41 | 249 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 94 | 77 | 43 | 309 |

**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 | 318 | 287 | 214 | 198 | 1017 |

**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 | 32 | 35 | 21 | 19 | 107 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 7/10/2021

## 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 | 444 | 453 | 414 | 411 | 1722 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 61 | 55 | 58 | 211 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 32 | 13 | 18 | 90 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 2 | 65 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 106 | 70 | 82 | 340 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 96 | 106 | 21 | 295 |

**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 | 31 | 51 | 48 | 30 | 160 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 29 |

## 2020-21 - Updated

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 444 | 453 | 414 | 411 | 1722 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 61 | 55 | 58 | 211 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 32 | 13 | 18 | 90 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 2 | 65 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 106 | 70 | 82 | 340 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 96 | 106 | 21 | 295 |

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 51 | 48 | 30 | 160 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 29 |

# 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).

**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 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 55% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 53% | -6% | 53% | -6% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| 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 | 64% | 62% | 2% | 67% | -3% |
| 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 | 71% | 70% | 1% | 70% | 1% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 25% | 55% | -30% | 61% | -36% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 59% | 56% | 3% | 57% | 2% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA Gr 9 + Gr 10 = Cycle Assessments (fall, winter) and FSA for Spring pending
ELA Gr 11 + Gr 12 = n/a
Mathematics Gr 9 = Algebra I Cycle 1 and 2 Assessments (including all grade levels) and EOC for Spring pending
Mathematics Gr 10 = Geometry Cycle 1 and 2 Assessments (including all grade levels) and EOC pending
Biology = Cycle Assessments (three total - all separated by grade level)
US History Gr 11 = Cycle Assessments 1 and 2 (all grade levels included in grade 11 data)

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 36 | 22 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30 | 14 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 7 | |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 6 | |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9 | 9 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 6 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 5 | |
| **Biology** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 61 | 59 | 59 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 53 | 50 | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14 | 30 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 46 | 42 | 46 |
| **US History** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 34 | 26 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25 | 16 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12 | 9 | |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 10 | |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22 | 34 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15 | 26 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6 | 18 | |
| | English Language Learners | 23 | 16 | |
| **Biology** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23 | 18 | 25 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21 | 17 | 26 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11 | 9 | 24 |
| | English Language Learners | 12 | 4 | 17 |
| **US History** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10 | 30 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 17 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 0 | |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 43 | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48 | 50 | 64 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 42 | 47 | 54 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 25 | 39 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 37 | 44 |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | All Students | 33 | 33 | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | 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 |

| 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 | 22 | 38 | 36 | 31 | 36 | 25 | 33 | 55 | | 92 | 17 |
| ELL | 23 | 32 | 26 | 32 | 33 | 14 | 34 | 29 | | 72 | 35 |
| ASN | 50 | 59 | | 52 | 39 | | 86 | 69 | | 100 | 65 |
| BLK | 36 | 43 | 38 | 30 | 41 | 17 | 44 | 63 | | 95 | 30 |
| HSP | 39 | 45 | 39 | 43 | 41 | 31 | 55 | 54 | | 85 | 44 |
| MUL | 56 | 52 | | 38 | 32 | | 65 | | | 93 | 64 |
| WHT | 59 | 50 | 38 | 55 | 50 | 53 | 71 | 79 | | 92 | 67 |
| FRL | 39 | 44 | 36 | 40 | 42 | 32 | 54 | 62 | | 86 | 50 |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 29 | 39 | 29 | 33 | 51 | 39 | 44 | 57 | | 67 | 18 |
| ELL | 17 | 39 | 38 | 22 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 52 | | 66 | 30 |
| ASN | 59 | 54 | | 70 | 61 | | 81 | 100 | | 80 | 67 |
| BLK | 40 | 47 | 48 | 22 | 38 | 23 | 42 | 49 | | 65 | 23 |
| HSP | 42 | 44 | 42 | 41 | 46 | 36 | 51 | 64 | | 78 | 28 |
| MUL | 33 | 41 | | 27 | 31 | | 53 | 64 | | 89 | 44 |
| WHT | 61 | 54 | 37 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 67 | 80 | | 87 | 57 |
| FRL | 40 | 47 | 39 | 35 | 42 | 29 | 50 | 63 | | 75 | 37 |

## ESSA Data Review

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) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 75 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 633 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| 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 | 37 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 65 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## 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?**

Our 9th and 10th grade ELA performance has not been meeting proficiency goals for the 2019 school. year. 10th grade ELA results from 2019 demonstrated that 51% of our students performed at proficiency on the ELA 2019 assessment.

Our 9th and 10th mathematics performance was at 64% in 2019 and we are awaiting results from 2020. Core mathematics failures are very high and we need to address them in 2019 through action steps in equitable grading.

Our ESE students performed on average in the 50-55% range as reported by their performance on the FSA Reading and Algebra EOCs in 2019.

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

ELA - 51% proficient
Algebra I - 64% proficient

These two areas provide the greatest opportunity for improvement. These areas are both below our goals in 2019 and are in need of overall improvement.

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

Attendance - interventions to be in place in 2021 for students who miss more than 10% of school need to include and not be limited to parent conferences, conferences with administrators, check in sheets, and positive intervention systems.

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

Our science data demonstrated the greatest improvement in 2019. Science Biology EOC scores had the highest increase from 60 to 65% proficient from 2018 to 2019.

Our math data demonstrated the second greatest improvement in 2019. Math proficiency percentages increased from 44 to 48% proficient from 2018 to 2019.

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

For both, common planning periods created the opportunity for more teacher collaboration.

In math, the teachers who had the most significant growth in student performance were aligned with the student needs in the master schedule. Additionally, MTSS Tier 2 supports were in place specifically targeting students who were Level 1 or Level 2 who needed additional support.

In science, the systems of common assessments, culturally relevant instruction with rigor, equitable and restorative grading in the classrooms and weekly PLC meetings to review data supported the increase. Focused notebooks were utilized in most classrooms.

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

Common planning across the individual subject areas (ie: Algebra, Geometry, Biology). Support for professional development to reinforce AVID Wicor strategies to promote rigor. Support for professional development in Focus Notetaking to support student learning. PLC meetings regularly to review data, realign goals as needed, and provide supports for remediation.

**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.**

AVID Wicor strategies
Focused Notetaking
Culturally Relevant Teaching
Restorative Practices (behavior and grading)

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

Utilizing the district-level supports
Data analysis after each Cycle assessment provided by the district.
Monitor and participate in PLCs regularly
Solicit student input for culturally relevant teaching and learning.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | DATA SOURCES TO REVIEW: Biology EOC, cycle assessments, common assessments, walk-through observations, PLC and collaborative planning documents<br>REFLECTION:<br>Our current level of performance is 51% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 Biology Cycle 3 Assessment. Our current level of performance is 67% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 Bio EOC (pending).<br><br>In science classrooms, we are seeing a decrease in overall student engagement and lack of rigor on student tasks. There was a reduction in culturally relevant teaching practices.<br><br>If the rigor of the instruction and tasks increased and the engagement levels increased, student achievement would increase to 70% proficient on the Cycle 3 Assessment in May 2022. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | We expect our performance level to be 70% proficient on Bio Cycle 3 assessment data by May 2022.<br>We expect our performance level to be 73% proficient on the Bio EOC assessment data by 2022. |
| **Monitoring:** | Data will be collected from Cycle 1 - 3 assessments, teacher-created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning documents/ notebook. This data will be reviewed at monthly and weekly PLC meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Strategy 1. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks including rigor by providing professional development opportunities for growth.<br><br>Strategy 2. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Focused notes require the student to organize thoughts, reflect, and document their own progress throughout the course. WICOR strategies are learning support strategies that can be customized to the individual student's need.<br>Common assessments and equitable grading increase student proficiency and engagement. |

### Action Steps to Implement

(Strategy 1) Focused notes require the student to organize thoughts, reflect, and document their own progress throughout the course. Teacher-created interactive notebooks will be utilized throughout each Semester. Students will generate goals and progress continually. Students and teachers will monitor student progress at it relates to standards mastery throughout the year.

**Person Responsible**    Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

(Strategy 1) WICOR strategies are learning support strategies that can be customized to the individual student's need. Teachers will attend appropriate professional development if needed. (Strategy 2) Teachers will utilize AVID instructional leaders in the classroom and throughout the course planning and lesson planning processes. Evidence of strategies will be documented in lesson plans and reviewed in PLC meetings. Teachers will use data from monthly PLCs to plan small group instruction and data stations. Frequent data chats with students to offer support and review student achievement goals.

**Person Responsible**    Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

(Strategy 1 and 2) Standards based common assessments and standards based equitable grading will continue to be utilized. Common assessments created by teachers and/or obtained from the district resources will be used to measure student success on each standard. Equitable grading practices will be used in each classroom to increase student proficiency and engagement.

**Person Responsible**    Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

(Strategy 1) Culturally Relevant Teaching will continue to be a strategy utilized. Teachers will attend AVID Culturally Relevant Training and/or a refresher professional development so all students are engaging in grade level complex tasks of the standards.

**Person Responsible**    Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

(Strategy 2) Assure that all data is being monitored and observed, particularly in subgroup areas of need. Create plans for improvement through instructional shifts and remediation based on needs identified through progress monitoring assessments.

**Person Responsible**    Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

(Strategy 2) UDL evidence of teachers using multiple methods of instruction and allowing for student autonomy in choosing how to demonstrate mastery of a standard. Evidence in lesson planning and classroom walkthroughs/observations.

**Person Responsible**    Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | DATA SOURCES TO REVIEW: FSA ELA scores, Cycle assessments, walk-through observations, PLC and collaborative planning documents<br><br>REFLECTION:<br>Our level of performance on the Spring 2019 FSA ELA is 51% proficient.<br><br>Our 9th grade level of performance is 22% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 English I Cycle 2 Assessment. Our 9th grade level of performance is 45% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 FSA (pending).<br><br>Our current 10th grade level of performance is 26% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 English II Cycle 2 Assessment. Our current level of performance is 33% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 FSA (pending).<br><br>In English classrooms, we are seeing a lack of consistency of instruction and formative assessments from one class to another. We are also observing a lack of student engagement.<br><br>If the consistency of instruction and formative assessment improved and the student engagement levels increased, student achievement would increase to 60% proficient on the English I and English II Cycle 2 Assessments in 2022 and 60% proficient overall on the Spring 2022 FSA ELA. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | We expect our performance level to be 60% proficient by Spring 2021 FSA ELA. |
| **Monitoring:** | Data will be collected from Cycle 1 - 2 assessments, teacher-created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning. This data will be reviewed at monthly and weekly PLC meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Focused Notetaking and WICOR strategies will continue to be a strategy utilized.<br>Culturally Relevant Teaching will continue to be a strategy utilized.<br>Common Assessments, equitable grading, and data tracking will be utilized. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Focused notes require the student to organize thoughts, reflect, and document their own progress throughout the course.<br>WICOR strategies are learning support strategies that can be customized to the individual student's need.<br>Common assessments strengthen the integrity of the lesson providing specific data for remediation when needed. Common assessments and equitable grading increase student proficiency and engagement. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks including rigor by providing professional development opportunities for growth.
-Infusing inquiry-based strategies and more to be included after district PLC meeting.

**Person Responsible**   Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

**Person Responsible**   Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org)

Assure that all data is being monitored and observed, particularly in subgroup areas of need. Create plans for improvement through instructional shifts and remediation based on needs identified through progress monitoring assessments.

**Person Responsible**   Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org)

## #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | DATA SOURCES TO REVIEW: ALG I EOC scores, Geometry EOC scores, Cycle assessments, walk-through observations, PLC and collaborative planning documents<br><br>REFLECTION:<br>Our level of performance on the Spring 2019 Math Achievement is 48% proficient.<br><br>Our Algebra I level of performance is 9% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 Algebra I Cycle 2 Assessment. Our Algebra I level of performance is 22% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 Algebra I EOC (pending).<br><br>Our Geometry level of performance is 34% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 Geometry Cycle 2 Assessment. Our current level of performance is 25% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 Geometry EOC (pending).<br><br>In Math classrooms, we are seeing a lack of consistency of instruction and formative assessments from one class to another. We are also observing a lack of student engagement.<br><br>If the consistency of instruction and formative assessment improved and the student engagement levels increased, student achievement would increase to 60% proficient on the Algebra I and Geometry Cycle 2 Assessments in 2022 and 60% proficient overall on the Spring 2022 Alg I and Geo EOC. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | We expect our performance level to be 60% proficient on Algebra I EOC and Geometry EOC by Spring 2021. |
| **Monitoring:** | Data will be collected from Cycle 1 - 2 assessments, teacher-created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning. This data will be reviewed at monthly and weekly PLC meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Focused Notetaking and WICOR strategies will continue to be a strategy utilized.<br>Culturally Relevant Teaching will continue to be a strategy utilized.<br>Common Assessments, equitable grading, and data tracking will be utilized. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Focused notes require the student to organize thoughts, reflect, and document their own progress throughout the course.<br>WICOR strategies are learning support strategies that can be customized to the individual student's need.<br>Common assessments strengthen the integrity of the lesson providing specific data for remediation when needed. Common assessments and equitable grading increase student proficiency and engagement. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks including rigor by providing professional development opportunities for growth.

**Person Responsible**    Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

**Person Responsible**    Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

Assure that all data is being monitored and observed, particularly in subgroup areas of need. Create plans for improvement through instructional shifts and remediation based on needs identified through progress monitoring assessments.

**Person Responsible**    Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | DATA SOURCES TO REVIEW: US History EOC scores, Cycle assessments, walk-through observations, PLC and collaborative planning documents<br><br>REFLECTION:<br><br>Our US History I level of performance is 71% proficient, as evidenced in 20-21 US History EOC (pending).<br><br>In US History classrooms, we are seeing a lack of consistency of instruction and formative assessments from one class to another. We are also observing a lack of student engagement.<br><br>If the consistency of instruction and formative assessment improved and the student engagement levels increased, we will be 75% proficient overall on the Spring 2022 US History EOC. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | We expect our performance level to be 75% proficient on the US History EOC by Spring 2022. |
| **Monitoring:** | Data will be collected from Cycle 1 - 3 assessments, teacher-created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning. This data will be reviewed at monthly and weekly PLC meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | TEACHERS ENGAGE STUDENTS IN WICOR AVID PRACTICES THAT SUPPORT MOVEMENT, COLLABORATION, AND ACCOUNTABLE TALK USING THE WICOR LEARNING SUPPORT STRUCTURE TO RAISE ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS AND CLOSE THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP IN SOCIAL STUDIES. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | (Strategy 1) Students need to interact and engage in WICOR strategies to assist all learners in being successful in class. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers include AVID WICOR strategies into daily lesson plans that support students at all levels.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

Social studies teachers will continue to integrate literacy standards into the social studies content via Document Based Question (DBQ) Project materials and Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) lessons.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers regularly incorporate knowledge checks (formative assessments) and use the collected data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the course content.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers meet in monthly PLC's to review student data (collected from multiple sources, including common assessment and/or quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to reviewing, remediating, and reteaching critical content related to the rigor of course standards/benchmarks.

**Person Responsible**    Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

Teachers conduct frequent data chats with students to offer support for student achievement and individualized goal setting.

**Person Responsible**    Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

| #5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our ELL students continue to excel and we must continue to support our ELL learners as we begin in 2021-2022. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | We expect our ELL performance level to be 50% proficient by Spring 2021 FSA ELA. |
| **Monitoring:** | Data will be collected from Cycle 1 - 2 assessments, teacher-created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning. This data will be reviewed at monthly and weekly PLC meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Each teacher plans and delivers lessons that meet the needs of EL students based on English language proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools to ensure academic success of each EL in their class. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Utilize the EL HS -Year at a Glance to get the ESOL team and the administrative team organized for the year ahead<br>• Schedule LY, LF, LA and Hispanic students into clusters in ELA classes that support their academic success<br>• Monitor placement into AVID and accelerated classes and options to increase access of Hispanic and EL students to acceleration opportunities and options<br>• Develop and implement an effective process to distribute information on language proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools information and data for each student coded LY to each teacher who works with the student;<br>• Develop and implement an effective process of monitoring that WIDA Can Do Descriptors and Model Performance Indicators (MPIs) are utilized in each classroom with LY students to plan and deliver effective and comprehensible instruction to ELs at their level of English language proficiency with ongoing student feedback;<br>• Provide learning opportunities for teachers and staff on the use of the WIDA Ellevation reports, Can-Do Approach and MPIs to support differentiated planning and instruction, based on ELs' language proficiency levels and needs;<br>• Provide regular opportunities for ESOL and content teachers to collaborate, co-plan, co-teach, co- assess, and co-reflect to bridge grade-level work for ELs and integrate language development within content specific instruction.<br>• Utilize Marzano Focus Model Go To Strategies for English Language Learners document to provide ongoing feedback to teachers of ELs in order to support the development of their practice in providing comprehensible and effective grade-level instruction to ELs.<br>• Create a plan for each student coded LY and LF to receive appropriate testing accommodations starting day one for each assessment; create a plan for monitoring<br>• Monitor the LF student performance to ensure academic success or provide |

appropriate supports; monitor implementation of testing accommodations for LF students to ensure consistency schoolwide
• Monitor fidelity of implementation of the EL Grading Policy schoolwide by utilizing the grading reports and following up with individual teachers for each course failure for LY students
• Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs [provide support and PD and establish clear expectations with accountability]
• Identify and enroll 11th and 12th grade LY, LF, LA and Hispanic students at the school in SAT and ACT Prep, Saturday ACT/SAT Boot Camp, etc. [for students who have not met this requirement]; send flyers to families in native language
• Utilize specific strategies listed above to create an inclusive learning environment for ELs [undifferentiated instruction designed for fluent English speakers is insufficient to meet the needs of ELs' linguistic and cultural needs; therefore, if these strategies are not implemented, the school is not providing adequate services to ELs].
• Utilize effective communication tools such as TALKING POINTS to reach families in the native language.

## Action Steps to Implement

Each teacher plans and delivers lessons that meet the needs of EL students based on English language
proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools to ensure academic success of each EL in their class.

Teachers will incorporate to department PLC's a section discuss appropriate supports to use by topic/unit/benchmark.

**Person Responsible**  Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org)

| #6. Other specifically relating to College and Career Readiness | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | All Countryside High School graduates need to be prepared for life in either a job, post-secondary institution, or any other contributing position in society. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | 100% of Countryside High School graduates will complete at least one industry certification or one college/post-secondary course upon graduation. |
| **Monitoring:** | This will be monitored through master schedule, counselors, and administration. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Monitoring of the cohort report. Feedback from instructors, students, and families regarding progression. Senior data chats. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | All students should be prepared for the post-secondary experience. This includes experiencing one or more facets of adult life (college/ certification) to become marketable. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Monitor the cohort report.
This is a weekly/monthly review through one on one student meetings, child study team meetings, and school counselor meetings with administration.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

Feedback from instructors, students, and families regarding progression.
This is a weekly/monthly review through one on one student meetings, child study team meetings, and school counselor meetings with administration.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

Senior data chats.
This is a weekly/monthly review through one on one student meetings, child study team meetings, and school counselor meetings with administration.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

Utilize AP potential report to ensure students are taking courses aligned with their potential for success. Process students who have the appropriate GPA for dual enrollment opportunities through quarterly counselor seminars with candidates. Counselors will utilize the AP potential report to ensure they are qualified and enrolled in the dual enrollment or appropriate advanced coursework.

| **Person Responsible** | Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

| #7. Other specifically relating to Bridging the GAP | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Increase African American student achievement in learning gains, graduation rate, acceleration, and course grades to align with the district strategic plan. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Increase the graduation rate of African American students to 100%. Increase the accelerated curricula of African American students to 100%. Demonstrate increase of learning gains in FSA ELA, Algebra I EOC, Geometry EOC, Biology EOC, US History EOC by 5% per assessment. Demonstrate increase of course grades from Ds/Fs by 5%. |
| **Monitoring:** | Monitoring of the cohort reports and Child Study Team. Monitoring of the master schedule. Monitoring of Cycle Assessment data throughout the school year. Monitoring of the quarterly grade reports. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Culturally relevant teaching training. Restorative instruction and assessment. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Culturally relevant strategies increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages. Restorative instruction and assessment creates positive relationships. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students.

2. Ensure that all new faculty are trained in culturally relevant processes and begin book study on this topic for professional learning groups.

3. Intro to Equitable Grading, Implementing Equitable Grading, and Equitable Grading PLCs will be required for all staff members as we will reduce our core course failures which greatly impact our students.

| **Person Responsible** | Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

2. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms

| **Person Responsible** | Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

3. Identify and provide additional culturally relevant books, resources and technology

| **Person Responsible** | Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

4. Ensure that all African American students who show potential to succeed in an AP or Dual Enrollment course or AVID are given the opportunity for admission.

**Person Responsible**     Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org)

5. Ensure school wide equitable grading practices are being implemented by providing equitable grading.

**Person Responsible**     Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org)

| #8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Ensure there is a clear and explicit alignment with the decision making, strategies, interventions and conditions for learning related to climate and culture, academic and behavioral competencies, and staff behavior to support and encourage academic excellence and equity for all. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | 1.Increased score on the PCS Classroom PBIS & Restorative Practices Assessment<br>2. Increased scores on the AVID CRT Assessment<br>3. Improved systems, data usage and practices as determined by survey results (Climate Survey & School-based survey) |
| **Monitoring:** | Monitored through survey and assessment results. Discussion in administrative and school leadership team meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 1. AVID strategies implemented quarterly (1) at faculty meeting; administration observation walk feedback.<br>2. Equitable practices & interventions discussed at monthly PLCs and administrative observation walk feedback provided to staff regarding student progression.<br>3. Culturally responsive behavior and supports will be evident in all classrooms. Administrative feedback to instructors regarding implementation. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Evidenced-based strategies and interventions are proven to be transferable to other school settings when the conditions for learning are effective and efficient. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. School wide training in cultural responsive and equitable practices (monthly during faculty meetings)

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

2. Continue to implement a modified ROAR program (August 2020) to reward and reinforce positive expecations.

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

3. SBLT will monitor and modify as needed selected evidence-based strategies and interventions (monthly).

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

4. Create a mid-year school wide survey to assess the culture of the school for all stakeholders (December 2021 or January 2022)

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

| #9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Countryside High School has established a positive behavior program (ROAR) and will continue to provide incentives to students to reinforce positive behavior on campus. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | |
| **Monitoring:** | |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. School wide training in cultural responsive and equitable practices (monthly during faculty meetings)

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

2. Continue to implement a modified ROAR program (August 2020) to reward and reinforce positive expectations.

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

3. Create a mid-year school wide survey to assess the culture of the school for all stakeholders (December 2021 or January 2022)

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
|---|---|

### #10. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measureable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize Focus and attendance reports to identify student attendance deficiencies.

**Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

2. MTSS and SBLT will provide incentives for perfect attendance; incentives for improved attendance; and for attendance quarterly to students.

**Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

3. MTSS will Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions as to assist all students in maintaining good attendance.

**Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

### #11. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measureable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### #12. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measureable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## #13. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our ESE students need additional supports in order to be successful academically on our large campus. We will also enhance their social opportunities on campus to be more ready for transition to post-secondary life. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Our ESE students will experience better results in their academic classes as demonstrated by a 25% decrease in core course failures. |
| **Monitoring:** | Semester data and cycle assessments will be used to determine students' final grades in core academic classes. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Provide differentiated, individualized or small-group instruction that is aligned to grade-level standards and Individualized Education Plan (IEPs)<br><br>Inclusive strategies to be discussed and shared in departmental PLCs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Planning for specially-designed instruction through departmental PLCs.<br><br>Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive the supports they need to be independent in each class.<br>ESE teachers will provide for specialized designed instruction and monitor student academic and SDI data through departmental PLCs.<br><br>Embed metacognitive strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize in important content. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives on an intentional and regular
schedule and make adjustments to accommodations and interventions accordingly. This will
be accomplished through departmental PLCs.

Provide for ongoing collaboration with all stakeholders including general education teachers, administrators, parents and school-based staff that support the student.

Provide regular opportunities for students to understand their disability, discuss their strengths, areas of
growth, needs, and progress towards short and long-term goals.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](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.

## 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.**

Activities/Clubs
Athletics
Culturally Responsive Teaching including Restorative Assessments and Grading
Fine Arts

Countryside High School strives to create student-centered and safe culture and environment for all. This is done by offering a multitude of social clubs and athletic activities as well as high functioning fine arts. Students have the ability to create their own social clubs by request for approval.

Students are encouraged to become engaged in their own culture and environment. Student input is solicited by administration and staff for all events and activities on campus.

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

Students
Countryside encourages student-leadership in the areas of promoting positive culture and climate at our school. Decisions which involve school improvement include the input from students and student leaders.

Faculty/Staff
Countryside solicits input from Faculty and Staff when promoting a positive and safe culture and climate through professional surveys. Monthly leadership team and faculty meetings are held to discuss input.

Parents/Families
Countryside solicits input from Parents/Families when promoting a positive and safe culture and climate through professional surveys. Monthly SAC and PTSA meetings are held to discuss input.

Volunteers/Community Members/Businesses
Countryside solicits input from Volunteers/Community Members/Businesses when promoting a positive and safe culture and climate through professional surveys. Monthly SAC and PTSA meetings are held to discuss input.

## Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | $0.00 |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | $0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | $0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: College and Career Readiness | $0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the GAP | $0.00 |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | $0.00 |
| 9 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | $0.00 |
| 10 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | $0.00 |
| 11 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | $0.00 |
| 12 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement | $0.00 |
| 13 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |