Chester County High School

School Improvement Plan

Mission Statement: The mission of Chester County High School is to provide a safe and secure environment that promotes student responsibility and actively engages all students in achieving the knowledge and skills required to graduate college and career ready and practice productive citizenship.

Vision Statement: Our vision is for Chester County High School to become a leader in providing quality education in the state of Tennessee by graduating goal-driven and multifaceted students who demonstrate exceptional achievement academically, personally, and professionally.

Troy Kilzer, Principal

December 1, 2011

2011 Revised Tennessee School and District Improvement Plan Template

<table>
<tr><td>School:</td><td colspan="2">Chester County High School</td></tr>
<tr><td>District:</td><td colspan="2">Chester County School System</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Analysis of last year's final results:</td><td>Areas of Greatest Progress: 2009-10 to 2010-11</td><td>Areas of Greatest Challenge: 2009-10 to 2010-11</td></tr>
<tr><td>Algebra I
All Students: 4.3% increase (from 30.9% to 35.2% proficient/advanced)
White: 5.4% increase (from 34.1% to 39.3%)
ED: 7.1% increase (from 25.4% to 32.5%)
English II
ED: 7.1% increase (from 38.3% to 45.4%)
White: 1.4% increase (from 61.0% to 62.4%)
Biology
All: 2.9% increase (from 58.8% to 61.7% in proficient/advanced)
A-Amer: 8.4% increase (from 27.3% to 35.7%)
White: 2.1% increase from 64.2% to 66.3%)
English I
Non-ED: 2.1% increase (from 69.1% to 71.2%)
U.S. History
All: 0.9% increase (from 95.7% to 96.6%)
SWD: 16.6% increase (from 66.7% to 83.3%)
A-Amer: 7.3% increase (from 82.4% to 89.7%)
ED: 4.2% increase (from 93.4% to 97.6%)
White: 1.4% decrease (from 99.3 to 97.9%)
Writing
All: 2.8% increase (from 91.4% to 94.2%)
A-Amer: 8.1% increase (from 79.4% to 87.5%)
White: 1.1% increase (from 94.6% to 95.7%)
ED: 2.2% increase (from 89.2% to 91.4%)
SWD: 21.2% increase (from 45.5% to 66.7%)
Male: 5.2% increase (from 86.0% to 91.2%)
Female: 0.9% decrease (from 98.7% to 97.8%)
TVAAS (1-yr. score vs. predicted score)
English II: 2.9 Biology: 4.1 U.S. History: 7
TVAAS (3-yr.) Biology: 6.25 U.S. History: 5</td><td>Algebra I
A-Amer: 5% increase (from 15% to 20%) proficient/advanced.
SWD: 5% increase (from 0% to 5%)
English II
All Students: 0.6% decrease (from 57.7% to 57.1% proficient/advanced)
A-Amer: 11.9% decrease (from 33.3% to 21.4%)
SWD: 2.5% increase (from 10% to 12.5%)
Biology
ED: 1.8% decrease (from 46.7% to 44.9%)
English I
All: 5.1% decrease (from 61.9% to 56.8%)
SWD: 40.0% decrease (from 40.0% to 0%)
ED: 13.4% decrease (from 54.3% to 40.9%)
White: 4.7% decrease (from 66.1% to 61.4%)
A-Amer: 1.3% decrease (from 34.6% x to 33.3%)
U.S. History
None
Writing
None
TVAAS (1-yr. score vs. predicted score)
Algebra I: -6.8 English I: -8.6
TVAAS (3-yr.)
Algebra I: -5.16 English I: -4.7</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source of Progress:</td><td>Source of Challenge:</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. The school implemented the ICU program for students with incomplete work, requiring them to complete it.
2. The "On-Call Tutoring" program allowed students to get retake assessments, demonstrating mastery of concepts and skills.
3. An awareness of student TVAAS data, identifying non-proficient students, enabled teachers to engage them in targeted classroom instruction, provide them with interventions, and direct them to tutoring opportunities, both during and after school.</td><td>1. There was a loss of instructional time because of student absenteeism of certain subgroups, and/or student checkouts of specific classes, and frequency of some students suspended from their regular high school setting due to their behavior.
2. There was inconsistent use of benchmark testing to identify students at risk and guide intervention to ensure that all students were achieving mastery of the content.
3. Teachers of the same subject area did not</td></tr>
</table>

	4. Teachers with gains closely aligned instruction and assessment with SPIs, and CLEs. 5. Students had more opportunities to use computers for instruction, assessment, and recovery 6. Consistent in-class use of formative assessments by some teachers resulted in gains for them.	work collaboratively with instruction/ assessment of content standards to share best practices. A lack of common planning time may be contributing factors. 4. Some teachers did not identify specific students of subgroups that were projected to score below proficient, did not involve those students in direct interventions, did not differentiate, and did not give attention to students who lacked foundational concepts. 5. A lack of time/additional resources for individual interventions for at-risk students may have contributed to the challenges.

Goals for this school year:	Overall Achievement Goals: (Aligned to First to the Top Goals)
	For 2011-2012, the percent of students scoring proficient/advanced on the **Algebra I** EOC will increase by 7% (from 35.2% to 42.2%). For 2011-2012, the percent of students scoring proficient/advanced on the **English II** EOC will increase by 5% (from 57.1% to 62.1%). <u>Other Achievement Goals:</u> For 2011-2012, the percent of students scoring proficient/advanced on the **English I** EOC will increase by 5% (from 56.8% to 61.8%). For 2011-2012, the percent of students scoring proficient/advanced on the **Biology I** EOC will increase by 5% (from 61.7% to 66.7%). For 2011-2012, the percent of students scoring proficient/advanced on the **U.S. History** EOC will be 90%. For 2012-2012, the percent of students reaching **ACT college readiness benchmarks** in all subjects will increase by 5% (from 12.1% to 17.1%).
	Subgroup Goals: (List each subgroup individually)
	Goals for subgroups will decrease the achievement gaps by at least 10%. **Algebra I** Non-White: 10% increase (from 20.0% to 30.0%) White: 5% increase (from 39.3% to 44.3%) Econ. Disadvantaged: 7% increase (from 32.5% to 39.5%) Non-Econ.Disadv: 5% increase (from 39.7% to 44.7%) Special Education: 15% increase (from 5.0% to 20.0%) Non-Special Educ: 7% increase (from 39.0% to 46.0%) **English II** Non-White: 10% increase (from 21.4% to 31.4%) White: 5% increase (from 62.4% to 67.4%) Econ. Disadvantaged: 7% increase (from 45.4% to 52.4%) Non-Econ.Disadv: <u>3% increase (from 68.8% to 71.8%)</u> Special Education: 10% increase (from 12.5% to 22.5%) Non-Special Educ: 5% increase (from 60.7% to 65.7%)
	Other Required Goal Areas:
	For 2011-2012, the **graduation rate** for CCHS will meet or exceed a 3-year average of 90%. For 2011-2012, CCHS's **value-added** mean percentile will increase by 3 for all EOC and AYP courses.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="5">Plan for this school year:</td><td colspan="2">Key strategies to achieve goals:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">1. Identify students labeled to be below proficient within all subgroups and ensuring those students to be actively engaged in learning.
2. Have teachers exclusively use the content standards of the coursework for instructional planning/presentation/assessing all students according to the SPIs and CLEs of the EOCs.
3. Provide ACT preparation, both in scheduled classes and on-line.
Algebra I
4. Increase time during the school day for student engagement in learning of Algebra 1 content.
5. Increase opportunities for individual students to use computer technology to increase their mastery of content and/or to recover lost credits.
6. Increase the use of computer technology to formatively assess students' level of mastery of the Algebra 1 content and develop individual interventions to increase students' levels of mastery.
English II
7. Use benchmark testing results to direct instructional planning and interventions for all students. All English II teachers are to work collaboratively with design and implementation of common instructional planning/presentation so that best practices regarding student learning can be shared and implemented.
8. Research and development of literacy labs to improve students' mastery of English content.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Key strategies to achieve progress for students with the greatest need:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">1. Identification of at-risk students based upon specific subgroups by teachers and using that awareness to ensure active engagement of all learners.
2. Ensuring students in lowest achieving subgroups have additional time afforded for content learning. Additional opportunities can occur before/after school, during ICU/on-call, technology intervention labs or during non-instructional times during the school day (i.e. study hall, lunch time).
3. Instructing, assessing and providing interventions to lowest achieving subgroups based solely upon the SPIs and CLEs.
4. Comprehensive use among all teachers of the academic vocabulary for all EOC courses with all students.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Projected costs and funding sources for key strategies:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">1. Computer technology
USA Test Prep - $1800 District General Funds
ThinkLink - $1990 District General Funds
Plato - $25,000 District General Funds
Credit Recovery/After school tutoring - $17,400 Funded by: Extended Contract Funds
ACT On-line/ Workbooks (Triumph College Admissions) - $2945.38 District General Funds</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Bench marks for Progress</td><td>Benchmark:</td><td>Timeline:</td></tr>
<tr><td>English II 9-week assessment: 45% proficient/advanced
55% proficient/advanced
65% proficient/advanced</td><td>December, 2011
February, 2011
April, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Algebra I ThinkLink assessments: 35% proficient/advanced
45% proficient/advanced
55% proficient/advanced</td><td>October, 2011
January, 2011
April, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Teachers will meet in departmental or cross-curricular meetings <u>monthly</u> to look at data, discuss instructional and student achievement issues, share best practices, and plan for improved student achievement.</td><td>November, 2011 – May, 2012</td></tr>
</table>