

Pinellas County Schools

Countryside High School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Countryside High School

3000 STATE ROAD 580, Clearwater, FL 33761

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

Demographics

Principal: Gerald Schlereth M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2019

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)	44%
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 Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

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

Educate and prepare each student for college, career, and life.

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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Whitaker, Fred	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Alexander, Lonnette	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Bernstein, Brad	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Overall, Erin	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Vicari, Robert	Principal
Principal	

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	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	102	77	120	389	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	241	181	160	800	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	29	10	18	88	

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	0	0	0	

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	75	56	43	12	186	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

96

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Students with two or more indicators															

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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	
Students with two or more indicators	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	51%	56%	56%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	51%	51%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	43%	42%	40%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	48%	45%	51%	44%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains	45%	44%	48%	48%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	41%	45%	41%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	65%	64%	68%	60%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	71%	73%	73%	72%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	90 (0)	102 (0)	77 (0)	120 (0)	389 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	218 (0)	241 (0)	181 (0)	160 (0)	800 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	31 (0)	29 (0)	10 (0)	18 (0)	88 (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.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	54%	54%	0%	55%	-1%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	47%	53%	-6%	53%	-6%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	53%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	64%	62%	2%	67%	-3%
2018	60%	63%	-3%	65%	-5%
Compare		4%			

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	71%	70%	1%	70%	1%
2018	72%	70%	2%	68%	4%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	55%	-30%	61%	-36%
2018	30%	57%	-27%	62%	-32%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
2018	52%	56%	-4%	56%	-4%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		7%			

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	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

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	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

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	
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 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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the percent scoring at proficiency in the Algebra EOC. We scored 25% proficiency in 19' down from just 30% in 18'. We believe a contributing factor to the level of performance was Alg 1a and 1b being blocked. Placing students in a course they are not performing well in for two hours, especially in the beginning of the day was not putting the students in the best environment for success. Additionally, the staffing for our algebra 1 courses must be more purposeful, in that we have looked at student growth trends in our math teachers and placing the right teacher in our algebra 1 classes to ensure they are the right fit. Instructional planning, strategies and interventions utilized did not consistently create conditions for learning, especially for our L25.

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 2018 was students scoring at proficiency in grade 10 ELA. In 2018 we scored 56% proficiency which was up from 41% in 2017, however we dropped to 47% in 2019. A contributing factor to the decline could be related to one of our 10th grade ELA teachers leaving during the first semester, during which we had a substitute in place for a month before our new teacher was in place. It should also be noted that in addition to our one 10th grade ELA teacher leaving first semester, two of our other 10th grade ELA teachers will not be returning for the 2019-20 school year.

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 showed the greatest decline from 2018 was students scoring at proficiency in grade 10 ELA. In 2018 we scored 56% proficiency which was up from 41% in 2017, however we dropped to 47% in 2019. A contributing factor to the decline could be related to one of our 10th grade ELA teachers leaving during the first semester, during which we had a substitute in place for a month before our new teacher was in place. It should also be noted that in addition to our one 10th grade ELA teacher leaving first semester, two of our other 10th grade ELA teachers will not be returning for the 2019-20 school year. In looking at the 2018 9th graders 50% achieve proficiency on the 9th grade ELA as 10th graders that cohort scored a 47%, this reflects a level of focus on data driven data chats with the students, and a focus on standards based, data driven, rigorous instruction.

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 our science scores. Science proficiency increased from 60% in 2018 to 65% in 2019'. One area of focus for instruction and planning this year that may have led to the increase was a focus on teachers evaluating cycle assessment results and determining areas in which differentiation and alternative instruction need to take place to increase each student's proficiency levels on the cycle assessments. Differentiation focused on including culturally responsive AVID strategies with regular AVID support provided to the teachers. The cycle assessment data was purposefully shared with students during the data chats after each cycle assessment with standards-based goal setting developed. A school wide focus on standards based, rigorous instruction planned from data with an emphasis on ELL strategies likely had an impact on the improvement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Data not yet available.

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

1. L25%
2. ELL: English Language Learner strategies and support for students and teachers
3. Increasing black student achievement in learning gains, graduation rate and acceleration.
4. Alg 1 proficiency rate
5. ELA proficiency rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Learners
Rationale	English language learners (ELL) was the only subgroup that Countryside High School fell below the ESSA federal index for improvement. English language learners were at 37%. In the 2019-20 school year English language learners will be without the traditional ESOL course thus meaning it is imperative to provide the support structure and resources to teachers, students and parents to ensure our ELL students maximize their achievement.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase ELL overall proficiency from 37% to 42% based on the ESSA federal index for improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Administration will provide the necessary resources to help 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 as well as enhance staff capacity to strategically plan and implement lessons which meet the needs of English learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With the ESOL course being removed, all teachers have the expectation more so than previous years to be able to provide more meaningful, impact-full ELL differentiation to their ELL students. Teachers must know their ELL students proficiency data and wida data and how to utilize the data to meet the individual needs of their students. In order to fully meet the needs of ELL students the teachers must not just know the students English capabilities by looking at their wida results and past assessments, but they must know what the data means, they must know how to effectively utilize that data in collaboration with the student learning needs to continue to modify/ differentiate instruction for each of the learners specific needs. Personalized learning cannot take place without a teacher first knowing the data, understanding what the data means and how that data will drive their instructions for sole purpose of increasing our ELL achievement results.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff development in ELL curriculum accommodations and modifications 2. Staff development in interpreting the WIDA assessment data 3. Staff development in applying data driven strategies 4. Develop a process for purposeful student scheduling of ELL students to ensure high level ELL students are placed with lower level ELL students. 5. Teachers in each subject area will have common planning to better collaborate the use of best practices and meet individualized learner needs. 6. Ensure school wide equitable grading practices are being implemented by providing equitable grading professional develop to all teachers and develop a school wide expectation for equitable grading.
Person Responsible	Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	L25%
Rationale	Targeting our L25 students for improvement will help us address all of our areas of need for Math, Science, ELA and ELL as well. Of our L25 students 40% scored at proficiency in ELA and Math while only 38% of our ELL L25 students made learning gains on the ELA. If as a school, the teachers and administrators, all identify and make a personal connection with everyone of our L25 students and make sure we have an improvement plan in place for them we will be able to see our proficiency and learning gain levels rise across the board.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase ELA and Math proficiency of our L25 to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Support staff to utilize student data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each L25 student by creating a personalized learning plan for each L25 student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Many of our L25 students are also students with 504's, IEP's and ELL students, students that fall into other sub groups in the school grading scale thus making it vitally important that teachers are fully aware of all of the student data not only including assessment results and cycle assessments, but IEP & 504 accommodations as well.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Four "L25 teams" are created to include 1 administrator, 1 guidance counselor and selected teachers. These teams will identify and put a face to each L25 student, gathering student data and working with previous teachers to identify which strategies worked best for the students. 2. The L25 teams will work with the teachers in sharing the information collected and work together to develop personalized learning plans for each L25 student with a developed personalized learning map. 3. Teachers in collaboration with their L25 team will monitor the students attendance, academic progress and behavioral progress and modify instructional practices as needed, with input from parents and student if the student is found to need additional supports. 4. PLC's and staff meetings will include opportunity for collaboration of their L25 personalized plans, and discuss student progress in their classes to continually assess student progress and best practices. 5. Parent/student conferences will occur when within the first 9 weeks if a student is struggling academically, behaviorally or with attendance. 6. Ensure school wide equitable grading practices are being implemented by providing equitable grading professional develop to all teachers and develop a school wide expectation for equitable grading.

7. Teachers in each subject area will have common planning to better collaborate the use of best practices and meet individualized learner needs.

**Person
Responsible**

Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Increasing black student achievement in learning gains, graduation rate and acceleration.
Rationale	Increase black student's proficiency rates in FSA ELA, Alg 1 EOC, US History and increase percent of black students enrolled in AP, honors and dual enrollment courses.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>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.</p> <p>Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The most important part of increasing any students achievement is to create relationships with the students. Positive and impact-full relationships must be forged with our students for the student to have a level of trust with the staff. Teachers must be able to understand the culture of their students and some of the many outside influences that can have an impact on the students educational day. The teachers and staff must be culturally aware and utilize strategies in the classroom that will better meet the needs of our learners. These strategies however must be utilized in conjunction with the teacher/ staff building that positive relationship with the students. By getting to know the student and developing a trusting relationship the teacher will be able to learn much more about the student and their needs in order to better accommodate their learning and social needs.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. 3. Develop learner profile and personalized learning plan for all black students who are not-on-track to graduate. 4. Identify and provide additional culturally relevant books, resources and technology to supplement core instruction representing diverse perspectives to increase student engagement. 5. Implement effective intervention strategies based on the close monitoring of students with personalized learning plans

6. Identify the root cause for academic inadequacies and provide the appropriate intervention; this may include mentoring.
7. Ensure equity by providing on-site, college readiness testing in every high school.
8. Ensure that all black students who show potential to succeed in an AP or Dual Enrollment course are scheduled into an appropriate course and provided supports.
9. Ensure school wide equitable grading practices are being implemented by providing equitable grading professional develop to all teachers and develop a school wide expectation for equitable grading.

**Person
Responsible**

Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Math proficiency rates
Rationale	Instructional planning, strategies and interventions utilized did not consistently create conditions for learning, especially for our L25.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase students performing level 3 or higher to 35% in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. Enhance staff capacity to support students through engaging, purposeful activation and transfer strategies. 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	Instructional planning, strategies and interventions utilized did not consistently create conditions for learning, especially for our L25.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will evaluate cycle assessment results and determine areas in which differentiation and alternative instruction need to take place in order to increase each student's proficiency levels on the cycle assessments. The cycle assessment data will be shared with students during data chats after each cycle assessment. 2. Teachers will continually monitor student progress through analyzing student formal and informal assessment results. Data chats must be held with students identifying areas in need of improvement and provided additional assistance to increase performance levels of the weak areas. 3. Math teachers will utilize data to develop scaffolding for students and for the development of differentiated instructional practices to increase student achievement. 4. Differentiation will include culturally responsive AVID strategies 5. Teachers will meet in monthly PLC's and during common planning to review student data (collected from multiple sources, including common assessment and/or quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement; or to develop lessons that meet the rigor of the course benchmarks. 6. Teachers will develop and employ unit plans based solely on standards Based Instruction for Learning, and develop standards-based learning goals and scales used to monitor the progress of their student's growth on standards based learning.

7. Teachers will continue to collaborate and attend district offered professional development opportunities as it relates to designing quality lessons and instructional practice which will promote highest student achievement in math related courses
8. Teachers engage in instruction that meets the necessary DOK level of rigor for students to obtain proficiency on the EOC.
9. Teachers in each subject area will have common planning to better collaborate the use of best practices and meet individualized learner needs and gain a deeper understanding of the content.
10. Ensure school wide equitable grading practices are being implemented by providing equitable grading professional develop to all teachers and develop a school wide expectation for equitable grading.

**Person
Responsible**

Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	ELA proficiency rates
Rationale	In 2018 we saw our ELA proficiency levels and learning gains increase dramatically. In 2017 41% of 10th graders achieved level 3 or higher and in 2018 56% scored level 3 or higher. In 2019 we saw our percent making proficiency decrease to 47%. There were personnel issues, that could have been a contributing factor to this decline, however with continued focus on best instructional practices, rigorous course work, standards based data driven instruction, and a renewed focus on effective ELA driven writing and reading strategies across all contents our ELA numbers will rise.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase ELA proficiency to 56% in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	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. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. 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	Teachers must know their students proficiency data and how to utilize the data to meet the individual needs of their students. In order to fully meet the needs of students the teachers must know what the data means, they must know how to effectively utilize that data in collaboration with the student learning needs to continue to modify/differentiate instruction for each of the learners specific needs. Personalized learning cannot take place without a teacher first knowing the data, understanding what the data means and how that data will drive their instructions for sole purpose of increasing our student achievement results.
Action Step	
Description	1. English teachers are to hold Data Chats with students. All students should have data chats within the first month of the school, and a minimum of once per quarter, reading teachers may choose to meet more frequently regarding progress and current/past performance on ELA assessments and in class progress. a. Teachers will evaluate cycle assessment results and determine areas in which differentiation and alternative instruction need to take place to increase each student's proficiency levels on the cycle assessments. The cycle assessment data will be shared with students during the data chats after each cycle assessment. Differentiation will include culturally responsive AVID strategies and pre-vetted lesson plans that are connected to the curriculum pacing guide. 2. The teacher and students will work together in developing student success goals. Goals should be both long and short term and accessible by

administration. These goals should be referenced by the student and teacher on a regular basis and updated to show progress monthly. These goals can incorporate into teacher's current methods of recording and tracking student progress.

3. Teachers engage in close reading of complex text along with text dependent questions, higher order responses and performance tasks aligned to Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS).

4. Teachers will develop and employ unit plans based solely on standards Based Instruction for Learning, and develop standards-based learning goals and scales used to monitor the progress of their students growth on standards based learning.

5. Teachers engage in instruction that meets the necessary DOK level of rigor for students to obtain proficiency on the FSA ELA.

6. Teachers in each subject area will have common planning to better collaborate the use of best practices and meet individualized learner needs.

7. Ensure school wide equitable grading practices are being implemented by providing equitable grading professional develop to all teachers and develop a school wide expectation for equitable grading.

**Person
Responsible**

Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

#6

Title

Equitable grading

Rationale

The administrative team after continually looking at student failure each 9 weeks sees an opportunity to develop a school wide equitable grading policy that is fair for all students, and that does not penalize students so much for assignments they didn't do or did poorly on but grades more on the desired effect of the class and the class objectives/learning targets. Did the student receive some poor grades leading up to a test, but pass the test? Did those poor grades impact that students overall grade so much that they recieved an F or a D but showed improvement towards the learning goal and passed the assessments and or EOC? How much should be penalize students for positively academically struggling in order to achieve mastery and the desired effect of the learning goals? At the end of a lesson, unit or semester, we see many times that students receive an A, B, or C on an exam yet receive a D or F for a selected 9 weeks grades, and have many F's and D's in the grade-book. Teachers evaluations are now set up as the equitable grading policy that Countryside is envisioning. Teachers are not penalized for "struggling" and they are tasked to improve in the areas they score needs improvement on for their first evaluation, and lowest scores are replaced with the higher score.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

To develop and measurable equitable grading scale.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Many current grading policies are focused on penalizing students for errors during their learning process which is not a reflection of the growth mindset. Our grading should be more focused on allowing the struggle, not penalizing for it, and creating a culture of retakes and redos.

Action Step**Description**

Work as a team with the administration and teachers in sharing our vision for a more equitable grading culture and work to collaboratively develop an equitable grading procedure.

Person Responsible

Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

#7**Title** Social Studies**Rationale** Social studies pass rate has been hovering in the low 70's the past few years, we had good, productive professional development with our US History teachers however, fidelity of implementation of the instructional strategies discussed was lacking.**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve**

Increase US History EOC proficiency to 75% in 2020, with a focus on the lowest subgroups of our black students and ELL students scored 49% and 52% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

The use of AVID CRT strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

We believe that if we utilize AVID CRT strategies, along with utilizing cycle assessment data to create student success plans, and differentiate instruction intently based on that data, that we will be able to reach our

Action Step

1. All teachers will attend AVID CRT on 8/12 & 8/13
2. Teacher & student Data Chats (district and/or school PLC) conducted with Unify reports to target benchmarks in need of remediation after each cycle assessment. After each Cycle assessment the AP in charge of US History will meet with all US History teachers as a group to conduct data chats and collaboratively come up with an instructional plan that focuses on the yellow and red benchmarks.

Description

3. Teachers incorporate avid strategies that support student success with the LAFS within the Social Studies curriculum, via Document Based Question (DBQ & Sheg) Project materials. Social Studies teachers will utilize data to develop scaffolding for students and for the development of differentiated instructional practices to increase student achievement. 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 identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement; or to develop lessons that meet the rigor of the course benchmarks. Teachers will evaluate cycle assessment results and determine areas in which differentiation and alternative instruction need to take place to increase each student's proficiency levels on the cycle assessments. The cycle assessment data will be shared with students during the data chats after each cycle assessment.
 - Content clarification report released after each US cycle assessment. (Highlighting for schools, individual areas/benchmarks with the most potential for growth)

- Loading US mini assessments into Unify (open all year) for teachers to receive data on EOC aligned questions during each unit
- Doc-a-day resource for benchmark content review with student tracking sheet (US History)

**Person
Responsible**

Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Science
Rationale	Countryside scored 65% at proficiency in science in 2019, 3% below the state average. We would like to be at or above the state average.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the percent of students scoring at proficiency in science from 65% to 69%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies to include the use of culturally relevant teaching strategies. 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	Countryside increased science proficiency in 2019 to 65% up 5% from 2018 with an emphasis on standards alignment of content and effective use of data for planning alternative instructional needs. With the emphasis on culturally relevant teaching and intentional/purposeful differentiation based on student individual needs we look forward to seeing our science proficiency scores continue to rise.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All staff will be AVID CRT trained on 8/12 & 8/13 2. Science teachers will utilize data to develop scaffolding for students and for the development of differentiated instructional practices to increase student achievement 3. Teachers will meet in monthly PLC's and common planning to review student data (collected from multiple sources, including common assessment and/or quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement; or to develop lessons that meet the rigor of the course benchmarks. 4. Teachers will evaluate cycle assessment results and determine areas in which differentiation and alternative instruction need to take place to increase each student's proficiency levels on the cycle assessments. Differentiation will include culturally responsive AVID strategies. The cycle assessment data will be shared with students during the data chats after each cycle assessment with standards-based goal setting developed.
Person Responsible	Erin Overall (overall@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Graduation Rate
Rationale	Our goal is to ensure every student graduates on time with a standard HS diploma.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase graduation rate to 95%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<p>Goal 1: To increase graduation rate to 95% in the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>Goal 2: To eliminate the gap between black and non-black graduation rate.</p> <p>Goal 3: To ensure all students withdrawn are accounted for while assigning correct and good withdraw codes to these students to ensure accuracy of our denominator to precisely track our graduation rate.</p> <p>Goal 4: To maintain a high level of communication with parents and students regarding graduation requirements and their students' status for on time graduation.</p> <p>Goal 5: To develop relationships with all off track seniors via mentoring and CRT classroom strategies.</p>
Person Responsible	Fred Whitaker (whitakerf@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Raise graduation rate to 95%