
Chester County High School

School Improvement Plan

2015-2016

PLANNING TEAM

Please Identify all planning team members, including title.

Ricky Catlett, Principal; Jeff Cupples, Asst. Principal; Clay Murley, Asst. Principal; Ellen Holl, Guidance; Carol Ann Williams, Data Coach; Jeff Lewis, Math Department Chair & Teacher; LeighAnn Skaggs, English Department Chair & Teacher; Teresa Crouse, Science Department Chair & Teacher; Hunter Callis, History Department Chair & Teacher; Christie Pugh, CTE Director; Amy Wooley, Parent and Todd Beaver, Parent.

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and WHAT'S WRONG

Summarize your accomplishments and what is working for students and why.

We were identified as a Level 5 High School by the State Department of Education in Tennessee, which is a significant increase from a Level 3 the previous year. We demonstrated growth in all EOC courses, meeting predicted scores in all subjects, with the exception of Algebra I. We attribute this increase to an alternating block schedule, Math and English courses were double blocked. Our graduation rate increased from 88.4% in 2013-2014 to 93.5% in the 2014-2015 school year. This increase, although the previous year was uncharacteristic for our history graduation rates, was due to the implementation of a graduation coach. Due to a significant increase in student population, a designated faculty member to track the senior population was considered necessary.

ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

Accountability Achievement Targets – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reason for each.

Areas of Greatest Progress with Achievement Targets:

Gains were made in Achievement for all targeted subjects from the previous year. The largest gain was:

Biology with a 12.4 growth measure and a 15.9% gain in Proficient/Advanced in 2015 compared to previous years.

Algebra II had a tremendous gain of 17.8% gain in Proficient/Advanced in 2015 compared to previous years.

The graduation rate increased back to 93.5, from 2014-2015's rate of 88.4. Although not listed, the significant increase would meet target.

Sources of Progress:

1. Further awareness and use of individual student TVAAS data; identifying non-P/A students enabled teachers to engage them in targeted classroom instruction, provide intervention and before/after school tutoring.
2. Implementation of data coaching to decipher individual student reports
3. The implementation of College and Career Readiness (CCR) time into the day. This was

targeted instruction in Math, English, and Science for 30 minutes every day. Some students rotated through several targeted areas of instruction.

4. The Algebra II teachers had smaller classroom sizes than in previous years.

Areas of Greatest Challenge with Achievement Targets:

Although Algebra I demonstrated growth in 2014-2015 with a .9% increase of Proficient/Advanced, it did not reach target of average predicated score.

Sources of Challenge:

1. The math department had a first-time teacher as well as a new teacher to the school. There were some pacing and lab issues that were not resolved until mid-year that attributed to confusion for the students.

2. Because CCHS had the largest entering class of freshman in 2015, a third Algebra I teacher has been added. Doubling blocking has remained the same, and the three teachers have daily pacing meetings.

Accountability Gap Targets – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reason for each.

Areas of Greatest Progress with Gap Targets:

Algebra I/II BHNA vs. all students gap - dropped significantly from a 21.2 to 14.4, a 6.8% drop
English II/III BHNA vs. all students gap - dropped from 26.9 to 21.7, a 5.2% drop

1. Smaller class sizes in Algebra II
2. Algebra I, English II were double blocked.
3. The implementation of identifying students that struggled and creating a specified instruction pull-out time during the school day to target specific concerns.

Areas of Greatest Challenge with Gap Targets:

Algebra I/II ED vs. non-ED gap widened, 15.5 to 20.1, an increase by 4.6%
English II/III ED vs, non-ED gap widened, 24.3 to 25.7, an increase by 1.4%

Algebra I/II SWD vs. non-SWD gap widened, 20.3 to 57.4, and increase of 37.1%
English II/III SWD vs. non-SWD gap widened, 41.9 to 57.1, and increase of 15.2%

1. The expansion of federal guidelines for ED increased that target population. Many incoming students were identified as ED but came with insufficient testing of academic capabilities, mainly from out-of-state. Although assessments of academic progress were conducted, they were not conducted in a timely enough manner to adequately to close the gaps for those students.
2. The students with gaps are significant, and this issue is an immediate area of concern. Future inquiry into the reasons for such a significant gap change are currently being discussed. In the meantime, the students who are disabled have several para-professionals that are scheduled into various classrooms throughout the day to add in learning and provide pull out if necessary.

ACADEMIC DATA

English I – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reasons for each.

English I continues a positive trend of increasing our populations to Proficient/Advanced, with a 1.8% increase. Although overall the ED population of our school is struggling, they are making significant gains in English I with a 12.4% increase in P/A. Per our TVAAS data, this growth has pushed our school to a level 5 with 4.8% growth measure.

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
English I	2013	213	706.1	42	706.6	42	-0.4 LG	1.5	39	Level 3
	2014	213	704.9	39	707.6	42	-2.5 LR	1.5	22	Level 2
	2015	214	711.6	46	706.1	38	4.8 B	1.4	92	Level 5
	3-Yr-Avg	640	707.5	42	706.8	41	0.6 LG	0.9	54	Level 3

We attribute the success of English I to two main things. First, the teachers in English I are dynamic and connect with the students, which provides a nurturing environment to learn. Secondly, the push for literacy during specific pull out time (CCR) contributed. This time had specific instruction on tasks everyday that enhanced students' literacy. Lastly, the library had a drastic change of appearance and climate. The library began carrying appropriate literature relative to students and began reading competitions and provided prizes. The library saw an almost 400% increase in reading.

With a P/A% of 72.9 the district ranks 64th in the state. 64th is almost in the exact middle of the rankings. Chester County is accustomed to ranking higher. On the other hand, it should be noted that in the TVAAS analysis section Chester County's English I students demonstrated outstanding growth (5.8). This could lead to the conclusion that the problem lies not so much in the English I class as it does in the level at which our students enter the class. Looking back at the cohorts previous levels of P/A%, we see that the group entered the 9th grade with around a 40% P/A%. This being the case, it appears that the English I teachers at CCHS are doing a commendable job.

English II – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, indentifying underlying reason for each.

English II continues a positive trend of increasing our populations Proficient/Advanced, with a 1.7% increase. Although overall the ED population of our school is struggling they are making significant gains in English II with a 10.9% increase in P/A. Per our TVAAS data, this growth has pushed our school to a level 5 with 4.4% growth measure.

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
English II	2013	192	704.7	46	703.1	44	1.4 LG	1.8	60	Level 3
	2014	203	707.2	46	703.3	40	3.6 G	1.8	78	Level 4
	2015	202	711.1	49	706.1	43	4.4 B	1.6	88	Level 5
	3-Yr-Avg	597	707.7	47	704.2	42	3.2 B	1.0	80	Level 5

We attribute the success of English II to two main things. First, the teachers in English II are dynamic and connect with the students, which provides a nurturing environment to learn. Secondly, the push for literacy during specific pull out time (CCR) contributed. This time had specific instruction on task everyday that enhanced students literacy. Lastly, the library had a drastic change of appearance and climate. The library began carrying appropriate literature relative to students and began reading competitions and provided prizes. The library saw an almost 400% increase in reading. This course was also double blocked.

This subject area is definitely a strength. The P/A% is 73.1% and ranks 21st in the state after ranking 50th and 43rd in the two previous years. The amount of P/A% improvement as compared to the previous cohort ranked 17th in the state.

English III – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, indentifying underlying reason for each.

English III continues a positive trend of increasing our populations Proficient/Advanced, with a 1.1% increase. Although overall the ED population of our school is struggling, they are making significant gains in English III with a 7.7% increase in P/A. Per our TVAAS data, this growth has pushed our school to a level 5 with 5.9% growth measure

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
English III	2013	163	712.9	51	709.8	48	2.9 G	2.6	61	Level 4
	2014	180	709.0	45	708.0	45	1.4 LG	2.6	53	Level 3
	2015	190	720.3	54	713.8	46	5.9 B	2.1	87	Level 5
	3-Yr-Avg	533	714.2	50	710.6	46	3.4 B	1.4	74	Level 5

We attribute the success of English III to two main things. First, the teachers in English III are dynamic and connect with the students, which provides a nurturing environment to learn. Secondly, the push for literacy during specific pull out time (CCR) contributed. This time had specific instruction on tasks everyday that enhanced students' literacy. Lastly, the library had a drastic change of appearance and climate. The library began carrying appropriate literature relative to students, and began reading competitions and provided prizes. The library saw an almost 400% increase in reading.

English III rounded out a strong year for our high school English department. The P/A numbers do not appear impressive at 54.1%, but this level ranks Chester County 21st in the state. The district has ranked in the top 25 for at least three consecutive years. Our ranking fell, but our P/A% amount of improvement ranked 21st in the state also.

Algebra I – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, indentifying underlying reason for each

Algebra I is slowly rebounding after a few years of not meeting target. It is continuing its positive trend of increasing our populations of Proficient/Advanced, with a 0.2% increase. Although overall the ED population of our school is struggling they are making significant gains in Algebra I with a 5.7% increase in P/A. Per our TVAAS data, this growth has pushed our school from a level 1 in 2014 to a level 3 in 2014 to a level 3 with 8.1% growth measure that still leaves us in the negative with a -1.1%.

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
Algebra I	2013	198	720.8	41	709.3	34	12.0 B	3.1	79	Level 5
	2014	175	719.7	39	729.1	45	-9.2 R	3.3	29	Level 1
	2015	195	721.8	36	723.2	37	-1.1 LG	3.2	48	Level 3
	3-Yr-Avg	568	720.8	39	720.2	38	0.6 LG	1.8	51	Level 3

We see the marginal success that Algebra I is having. The school principal has identified scheduling and structural problems in the way the subject was constructed last year and has made drastic changes. Common planning was implemented for the Algebra I teachers, pacing guides were constructed, and better assessments of student progress were crafted based on state standards. The lab portion of the course has now been added as a support and not a continuation of the course to help the students fully understand material.

The Algebra I program appears to be about average in the state ranking at 55th out of 117. The percentage P/A is 70.3. Our ranking has faded over the past three years from 38th to 42nd and then to the current level.

Algebra II – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, indentifying underlying reason for each

Algebra II continues a positive trend of increasing our populations Proficient/Advanced, with a staggering 17.8% increase. Although overall the ED population of our school is struggling, they are making significant gains in Algebra II with a 8.7% increase in P/A. Per our TVAAS data, this growth has pushed our school to a level 5 with 11.8% growth measure

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
Algebra II	2013	150	721.8	50	707.4	39	13.9 B	3.9	74	Level 5
	2014	177	720.7	43	716.5	39	4.0 G	3.4	54	Level 4
	2015	201	737.0	52	725.0	42	11.8 B	3.1	73	Level 5
	3-Yr-Avg	528	727.2	49	717.1	41	9.9 B	2.0	70	Level 5

Algebra II made statistically significant gains last year. Some factors include better understanding of student data and implementation of data into classroom instruction. The Algebra II teachers relied heavily on individualized student data to target the students that needed specific development in weak areas. They also used high volumes of ACT prep materials to guide the instruction of their classes, closely aligning them with Quality Core.

When you look at all of the Algebra II data, CCHS teachers were rock-stars last year. After experiencing a very poor year when our ranking dropped from 35th to 73rd in the previous cycle, the realigned teaching team soared back to a ranking of 41st in the state. We expect to rank higher, but when you include TVAAS 9.2 growth, it becomes obvious that the teachers of this subject did an outstanding job.

Biology – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, indentifying underlying reason for each

Biology I continues a positive trend of increasing our populations of Proficient/Advanced, with a staggering 14.3% increase. Although overall the ED population of our school in struggling, they are making their most significant gains in Biology I with a 25.1% increase in P/A, since 2013. Per our TVAAS data, this growth has pushed our school to a level 5 with 12.4% growth measure

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
Biology I	2013	149	694.7	29	699.8	34	-4.8 LR	3.5	27	Level 2
	2014	200	695.0	29	700.8	34	-5.4 LR	2.7	19	Level 2
	2015	201	719.7	51	712.3	42	7.0 B	2.4	83	Level 5
	3-Yr-Avg	550	703.9	36	704.7	37	-1.1 LG	1.7	33	Level 3

Biology I made statistically significant gains last year. Some factors include better understanding of student data and implantation of data into classroom instruction. The Biology I teachers relied heavily on individualized student data to target the students that needed specific development in weak areas. They also increased the literacy in their classrooms, with designated instructional time for literacy, as well as focused assessments and assignments around literacy.

We would be remiss not to celebrate outstanding results in Biology I. With a P/A% of 76.9, the cohort ranked 25th in the state after being at 74th and 80th in the two previous years. Our P/A% improvement ranked 8th in the state.

U.S. History– Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, indentifying underlying reason for each

US History has no data for the 2014-2015 school year.

Subj ect	Ye ar	Nr of Stude nts	Avg Sco re	Av g %-ile	Avg Predic ted Score	Avg Predic ted %-ile	Growt h Measure	Stand ard Error	Growt h Measure %-ile	Scho ol vs State Avg
US History	2013	160	537.2	62	527.5	47	9.3 B	2.1	89	Level 5
	2014	162	532.6	53	526.2	43	5.9 B	1.9	86	Level 5

Although no data is provided for the 2015 school year we can tell from previous years that US history continues to make progress despite already proving stellar performance.

Progress/Growth Data

TVAAS – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reason for each.

The high school EOC Math students (Algebra I/Algebra II) grew at least at expected rates. Algebra I's average student growth was 0.1 which indicated the expected growth with "rock solid teaching." We see in this subject that quintiles 2 and 3 had strong growth, but the lowest quintile and the two top quintiles exhibited very weak growth. At a TVAAS rate of 9.2 our Algebra II teachers preformed outstandingly! The quintile analysis reveals a "reverse shed" pattern with the two lowest quintiles growing at a rate of over 15. All were above zero.

We see the marginal success that Algebra I is having, causing the decline previously identified. The school principal has identified scheduling and structural problems in the way the subject was constructed last year and has made drastic changes. Common planning was implemented for the Algebra I teachers, pacing guides constructed and better assessment of student progress were crafted based on state standards. The lab portion of the course has now been added as a support and not a continuation of the course to help the students fully understand material.

Algebra II made statistically significant gains last year. Some factors include better understanding of student data and implementation of data into class room instruction. The Algebra II teachers relied heavily on individualized student data to target the students that needed specific development in weak areas. They also used high volumes of ACT prep materials to guide the instruction of their classes, closely aligning them with quality core.

Our Biology I students grew at a rate of 5.8 after having our two previous cohorts demonstrate growth "in the red." Extremely impressive on the quintile graph is a growth of near 10 for quintile 1 after having been significantly lower with previous cohorts. All other cohorts were above average in growth with the exception of quintile 5. We did not meet the needs of our 16.9% of students that are

classified in the 5th quintile. Their growth score was a negative 4.6.

Biology I made statistically significant gains last year. Some factors include better understanding of student data and implementation of data into class room instruction. The Biology I teachers relied heavily on individualized student data to target the students that needed specific development in weak areas. They also increased the literacy in their classrooms, with designated instructional time for literacy as well as focused assessments and assignments around literacy.

Chemistry growth is establishing a pattern of being consistently strong (2015 – 17.3, 2014 – 16.2). All quintiles grew at an above average rate.

Subject	Year	Nr of Students	Avg Score	Avg %ile	Avg Predicted Score	Avg Predicted %ile	Growth Measure	Standard Error	Growth Measure %ile	School vs State Avg
Chemistry	2014	163	713.9	54	693.8	38	19.4 B	3.5	87	Level 5
	2015	193	721.7	52	701.6	37	19.6 B	3.1	91	Level 5

All English courses had strong growth (Eng. I – 5.8, Eng. II – 4.3, Eng. III – 5.0). Review of the quintiles reveals that English I was at or above expected growth with all levels of learners. Impressive is that English I has a history of quintile 1 being around -10 on the chart, but this year the students in the lowest quintile grew at a positive 10. English II had growth above zero with quintile 1 after being around -10 with that quintile in the past. Eng. II's weakest growth area is quintile 5 which had 31 students who average growth of -1.4. All quintiles for English III were average or above with quintile 1 growing near 4 after historically being around -15! The course had also been weak in quintile 5 (around -5) which this year was in the green.

We attribute the success of English department to two main things. First, the teachers are dynamic and connect with the students, which provides nurturing environment to learn. Secondly, the push for literacy during specific pull out time (CCR) contributed. This time had specific instruction on tasks everyday that enhanced students literacy. Lastly, the library had a drastic change of appearance and climate. The library began carrying appropriate literature that was relative to students and began reading competitions and provided prizes. The library saw an almost 400% increase in reading.

COLLEGE/CAREER READINESS

Explore/Plan/ACT – Analyze your data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reason for each.

All 4 ACT subtest and the composite showed gains from the previous year. English demonstrated a gain of 0.2%, Math a 0.1% gain, and Science a 0.5% gain. Our largest overall gain was in Reading, with a 0.7% gain, from 19.2 to 19.9. Our overall composite gain was 0.5 gain, going from 19.2 to 19.7. We attribute the higher gains in reading and science to the push of literacy in all subjects during our CCR (college and career readiness) time. Since Science is such a heavy laden subtest with reading, the push for literacy positively impacted our score results.

Our greatest challenge is our push to get every student HOPE scholarship qualified with a 21 composite. This year we implemented Math and English ACT prep courses into the day that were offered to every student, regardless of where they were already scoring on the ACT.

Plan Results 2015 (current 11th graders)

Positives:

- Our school average English score is above the ACT College and Career Readiness Benchmark of 15 at 16.95.
- Our school composite average increased from 17.28 in 2014 to 17.47 in 2015.
- In Math, our school average increased from 17.26 in 2014 to 17.60 in 2015.
- In Science, our school average increased from 17.66 in 2014 to 18.50 in 2015.
- For evaluation composites, our school scored a level 5 in growth for composite score, English Math, and Science.

Challenges:

- On average, our students were below the ACT College and Career Readiness Benchmarks in Math, Reading, and Science.
- Our lowest overall score is in Reading, which also represents a trend in our recent ACT scores as well.
- Although we are showing growth in many areas, our students, on average, are not meeting the College and Career Readiness Benchmarks set forth by ACT.

EXPLORE

Subtest	Avg Growth Index	State Ranking	%ile
English	-0.79	352th of 553	36
Math	-0.65	335th of 553	39
Reading	-3.51	537th of 553	3
Science Reasoning	-3.76	534th of 553	3
Composite	-2.85	467th of 553	16

ACT Results for 2015 (current 12th graders)

*Please note the information given is from the ACT Student Score report ONLY and internal mathematical calculations. The official 2015 ACT Report with State and National Data has not been made available as of 8/17/15.

Positives:

- Our average English sub score exceeds the ACT College and Career Readiness Benchmark of 18 at 18.11.

Challenges:

- In all subject areas and overall composite, we saw a decrease in scores as compared to the 2014 results.
- In Math, Reading, and Science, our school averages did not exceed ACT College and Career Readiness Benchmarks.

Graduation Rate – Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reasons for each.

The Graduation Rate had a decline of 5.1% in the 2013-2014 school year, with the SWD taking the hardest hit with a decline of 31.3%. Based on our previous years, we attribute the decline to the increase of students and lack of counselors and faculty to track student progress. The 2014-2015 school year rebounded at 93.5% which is 2.2% higher than the 2012-2013 school year. The success of the 2014-2015 school year can be attributed to several factors: the addition of another school counselor, the addition of a specialized graduation coach for all students but specifically at-risk students and summer time credit recovery being monitored heavily by two certified Math, and one English teacher, and one Science. All of these practices are still in place for the 2015-2016 school year, and we look forward to maintaining and growing our graduation rate.

Other College/Career Readiness Data – (AP, dual enrollment, dual credit, etc.). Analyze the data and provide a summary of progress and challenges, identifying underlying reasons for each.

The high school engages in many Dual Enrollment and Dual Credit possibilities, with Freed Hardeman and JSCC. Beginning in students junior year, they can begin DE and DC courses through both educational institutions, included but not limited to: English, history, math and science. Approximately 15 of our seniors from last year took all dual enrollment for the entirety of their senior year. We also offer other programs through our CTE department where students can become student ASE certified in auto mechanics and gain CNA certification through our nurse education program.

This year we began an additional relationship with JSCC with our CPT manufacturing program. West TN has a number of jobs that are open in the manufacturing field, so we partnered with JSCC to help students become ready for the workforce by training them in manufacturing. They will have the chance to enter the work force or continue their manufacturing education at JSCC. This is all in efforts to provide our community with an educated workforce as well as retain/sustain the community's population.

The high school also offers AP English to students interested in such an intense program. The program holds a limited number of students, 13, is quite rigorous, and is taught by our department chair.

SCHOOL CLIMATE and CULTURE

Consider a variety of data sources related to school climate and culture and summarize. Cite specific examples where possible, considering differences in subgroups where relevant. Data evaluated could include safety, discipline, survey responses (parent, teacher, and/or student), attendance, etc.

School Safety

The school employs a School Resource Officer (SRO). Although he/she is shared among all schools in the district, they are head quarter at the high school. The SRO, in conjuncture with the high school, conducts many school safety programs. They do Click-it-or-Ticket seat belt check, drug awareness week, and a school bullying program.

The school goes through safe schools planning with Coordinated School Health, where every staff member is trained on various possible incidents, including but not limited to blood borne pathogens, active shooter training, and youth suicide.

Professional development was provided on how to conduct soft and hard lock downs. The SRO and the sheriff's department conducted training on how to response to a crisis situation that requires lock-down. Earlier in the year we had an unfortunate event when these lessons were put into practice. Thankfully, everything was fine that day, but it showed us where we were weak and what needed improving if presented with that situation again. A staff meeting was held, SRO consulted, and changes implemented immediately following the incident.

Discipline

During the 2014-2015 school year there were 728 referrals to the office that requires disciplinary action. Of those referrals, 34% of them were for females and 66% were for males. The percentage of SWD that were referred to the office for discipline is indefinable, as the new management suite does not identify students with disability. Of the 728 referrals, our school demographics can be placed here to accurately reflect incidents: 84% were Caucasian, were 13% African American and the remaining 3% identifies the Hispanic/Two or more races. 29 of the 728 referrals were drug related, while were 672 classified as general misconduct. Of the rest, zero percent related to theft/vandalism, 2 were related to non-firearm weapons and 54 were categorized as fighting/assault/bullying.

Suspensions: Only 5.1% of our student population was suspended in the 2014-2015 school year. The highest percent were of African American students at 9.2% and ED students second highest at 7.6%. These once again are the two areas of need within our school. There attendance and discipline are factors in student success.

We employ 2 assistant principles that handle all the discipline once it has reached the main office. There are 2 guidance counselors that intervene if aware of any tension, bullying, or other problems within the student population.

Attendance

During the 2014-2015 school year we had 93.6% attendance rate. The majority of those absences were excused/doctor statement at 61%. Only 26% were unexcused and the remainder 5% were excused but fell under religious reasons or funerals. The excused absences also have several school related activities like sports and field trips that fall under that umbrella. To eliminate unnecessary absences, better communication between parents and students regarding the reasons for missing school has been developed. The high school also works closely with truancy court to help curb excessive absents or truancy in some students. The group with the highest absent rate is our SWD are 91.7% which could be one of the indicators of why this group of students is not meeting predicted targets.

ADDITIONAL AREAS

Consider your progress in the following areas:

- RTI2
- Professional Development
- Teacher Recruitment, Retention, and Evaluation
- Technology Access and Use

RTI

Students have been grouped into the three tiers, with intervention beginning after fall break. The teachers have been given individual data information on the students assigned to them during RTI, so

that targeted areas can we addressed. Students who fall in the at risk category are placed in either a 30 minute intervention class daily. Students are taught with research based interventions and are progress monitored to determine if the intervention is working, as well as if the student has moved out of his/her tier. Students who do not respond to the intervention after 8 weeks have a change made to their intervention plan and are continued to be progress monitored every other week. Student's responses to intervention are monitored bi-weekly and changes are made as needed.

PD

Encourage and provide opportunities for

teachers to collaborate and influence decisions regarding professional development curriculum and topics and other school policies, procedures, and programs.

Target professional development to meet the needs of each individual teacher.

Develop professional development in accordance with the current programs and operating conditions at the school/district level.

Recognize and reward teachers who have completed professional development and effectively incorporated it in the classroom.

Evaluate professional development repeatedly: the school/district measures teaching practices and links them to student achievement outcomes as evidenced through data

Encourage and prepare educators to identify the training they need

Determine whether they have successfully implemented what they learned in their classrooms

Evaluate their student achievement data to ascertain if those practices have had a positive impact on student achievement

Teacher Recruitment, Retention, and Evaluation

1.) Recruitment and retention of Highly Qualified teachers

To meet the needs of recruiting, retaining, and training high quality teachers and principals.

To meet content re-certification requirements

To maintain the mentoring program to monitor new teachers in their first year. The purpose of the mentors is to provide support in administrative processes, school based processes and best instructional practices.

To support and keep beginning teachers

2) Utilize various methods for hiring Highly Qualified teachers

3.) Recruiting fairs (UTM, FHU, Union, Bethel, etc.)

4.) Provide incentive to teachers with full time mentors. Provide all beginning teachers with a mentor, for at least one academic year. This installation adds connectivity to the school and to the individual that can last the length of employment but also provides a personal aspect to our school, as one big family unit working together.

Technology

Teachers have laptops and Smart boards in their classrooms, and training is provided often by the in-house technology team. Attendance is taken in Synergy every period by every teacher. Teachers have access to mobile computer labs, with the English department having their own mobile lab to share. The library has a technology area that teachers can utilize, as well. We have two fully equipped computer labs on campus that can be utilized, but they are also shared with our SAILS program and Computer courses. Our computer programming classes received a full equipped Mac computer upgrade this past year. We have an in-house tech team that provides technical support during school hours when needed, as well as a district based technology department. We also provide wireless connectivity throughout the building for staff and student access.

All teachers have printers in their classrooms, and one copier in the building located in one of the teacher workrooms.

The biggest challenge is the number of students and their technology needs, verses the volume of current accessible computers. The school has experienced a significant rise in enrollment which has left the number of computers insufficient, especially with the increased demand in testing. A detailed testing schedule coupled with the in-house tech team on call for unforeseen issues has created a successful initial review of needs.

One of the biggest challenges for the technology department is keeping up with the fast pace of changes, not only in meeting demands for system hardware and software upgrades, but also in meeting the demands for staying up to date with online testing and other state reporting. Each year new updates are required, and even though we have been able to hire additional technology staff, we still have difficulty keeping up with the fast pace of all the changes coming down which require additional allocation of time for updates, etc, and in scheduling of staff that are not always readily available.

Parent and Community Involvement – Describe strengths and challenges around parent and community involvement.

Parent and Community Involvement

As with any high school, parent involvement can wane as the student progresses towards independence. Often times, changes in schedules or academic performance are delivered to the student so they can take charge of the course of their academic career. The high school hosts a variety of opportunities for the parents to become involved, including Breakfast with Santa, Alumni Banquet, and Freshman Breakfast. All of these opportunities give the high school the chance to show the community the progress we are making and the type of climate their students are being educated in every day. We also host several Parent/Teacher conferences throughout the year as a target time for parents to communicate to the teachers. This year we also opened up the Parent Portal to our grading system to parents so they can monitor their students' progress and communicate to the teacher directly. This year was also installed ICU, which is a database of missing assignments, that alerts parents via text when their student is missing work. The parents/students arrange a time for the assignments to be made up. The system is accessible to all staff, so everyone can see when the student isn't performing and can help them make up work and get back on task. Parents are also actively involved in different booster clubs, whether it be band, athletic or sponsoring the different grade level classes. We have an open door policy which allows any parent to come in and speak with guidance counselors or administrators at any point about their child's well-being, whether is academic

or social.

Communication Assessment Results with the Community

Individualized Profile Reports (IPRs) are sent home with every student who tested in one of the EOC courses. Individualized Explore and PLAN results are also sent home for the students and parents. The National Guard comes in a delivers detailed reports on the results of their entrance examination (ASVAB). The teachers do an exceptional job of relaying individual course assessment results to their students, and identify areas in need of improvement.

In addition, the testing that is preformed on SPED students is delivered to the parents and student during annual IEP meeting so that the parents can understand where their student is in regards to grade level performance.

PRORITIZED LIST OF NEEDS

List, in priority order, your areas of need as identified through the needs assessment. Prioritizing needs will identify the most critical areas where your work will begin with the creation of goals and strategies.

- 1. Increase targets with Economically disadvantaged students**
- 2. Increase targets with Students with Disabilities**
- 3. RTI development**
- 4. SPED graduation rate**

School Plan Prioritized Goals and Strategies

District-Level: Students with Disabilities who drop out before graduation

Description:

District-Level: The 2015-2016 school year the District will take steps to decrease the percentages for Students with Disabilities who drop out before graduation in the future from the current 7.4%. The current graduation rate of SWD students is 75%.

School-Level:

Performance Measure:

District-Level: Benchmark Testing Dropout Rate of SPED Students

School-Level:

5.1) District-Level: District support in establishing common benchmark assessments aligned in rigor and content to TNReady

District-Level: The Director of Schools contract with Barb Williams of Batelle for Kids to provide support for the district benchmark assessment program (Before August 31, 2015). Barb Williams to analyze all district benchmark assessments to assure focus on the TNReady Standards and the appropriate rigor. (Before April 26) ii. Barb Williams will provide feedback and support concerning the benchmark assessments I order to help bring them in line with the TNReady assessments. (Before April 26)

School-Level: Train staff on Batelle for Kids. Professional Development presented by Batelle for Kids

5.2) District-Level: Tracking subgroup progress toward proficiency regularly throughout the school year and adjusting instruction to address deficits

District-Level: The results of established benchmark testing in all high school subjects will be disaggregated by the Tier 1 teacher in order to track the progress of the individuals and the sub-group. (Individual Teachers) (1st quarter no later than Oct. 22, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 7, 3rd quarter no later than March 31)

School-level: RTI testing has been done, students have been placed in tiers, bi-weekly testing to determine progress and possible movement out of RTI, 30 mins of intervention every school day

5.3) District-Level: Collaborative Subject Data Chats at the teacher level with building level administrative support

District-Level: Teachers will have collaborative data meetings after each benchmark assessment which will include at least one building level administrator to evaluate the progress of the subgroup down to the individual student level. (Principal or Assistant Principal) (1st quarter no later than Oct. 22, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 7, 3rd quarter no later than March 31) 1. Building administrators will analyze the data presented and the discussion conducted in the data meetings. (Principal) (1st quarter no later than Oct. 26, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 11, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 4) 2. Based on the

above analysis, building administrators will identify areas of need in which individual or groups of teachers might need additional feedback, training, or other support in order to meet subgroup member needs. (Principal) (1st quarter no later than Oct. 26, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 11, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 4) 3. Building administrators will take needed steps to provided resources, feedback, or training needed by teachers. (Principal) (1st quarter no later than Nov. 2, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 18, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 11)

School-level: Data Team, PLC meetings, Data team shares information through varied resources, department meetings to further analyze individual student data.

5.4) District-Level: Common School Level Documentation of Data for subgroup throughout the school year

District-Level: Each school will establish a data room in which to graphically display all benchmark assessment data including subgroups. (Principals) (1st quarter no later than Nov. 2, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 18, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 11)

School-level: Data Team, PLC meetings, Data team shares information through varied resources, department meetings to further analyze individual student data.

5.5) District-Level: District Level Data Chats with Support from District Level Administration

District-Level: Building principals will be responsible for participating in data chats at the district level with instructional supervisors and the Director of Schools in one of two divisions (K-5 & 6-12) to share and discuss subgroup progress or the lack thereof after each benchmark assessment using data and findings discussed in the building level data meetings. (District Supervisors) (1st quarter no later than Nov. 2, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 18, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 11) 1. The Director of Schools and supervisors will analyze the discussions in order to determine district level supports for the school programs that might be needed. (Director of Schools) (1st quarter no later than Nov. 6, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 22, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 15) 2. The Director of Schools will allocate resources to meet the needs in collaboration with school principals. (Director of Schools) (1st quarter no later than Nov. 13, 2nd quarter no later than Jan. 29, 3rd quarter no later than Apr. 22)

School-level: : Data Team, PLC meetings, Data team shares information through varied resources, department meetings to further analyze individual student data

5.8) District-Level: i. SPED students will be included in the general education environment 80% or more of the day whenever it is deemed by IEP Team as appropriate.

District-Level: i. During the current school year the percentage of SPED students being served in this manner will be at least 65.5% of the SPED population. ii. Special education teachers and school principals will be notified in writing by the SPED Director of the 80% class time goal in order to assure compliance in the writing of individual IEPs. iii. SPED teachers will report the percentages of SPED students meeting the goal

of 80% to the SPED Director. (SPED Director) (First reported no later than December 15, Second report no later than May 15)

School-level: school counselors aid in the scheduling of SPED students and serve as an LEA in IEP meetings.