

Collier County Public Schools

Immokalee High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Immokalee High School

701 IMMOKALEE DR, Immokalee, FL 34142

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Clara Calderon

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 94% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | <p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p> |
| School Grades History | <p>2018-19: C (44%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (48%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (41%)</p> <p>2015-16: C (42%)</p> |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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

To provide educational excellence that prepares students to be college, career, and life ready.

Provide the school's vision statement

Through shared experiences, we are committed to achieving excellence by developing a sense of community among students, faculty, and parents. All will engage in supporting the school mission through school-wide initiatives and high expectations.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Calderon, Clara | Principal | <p>As Principal, Ms. Clara Calderon's focus is on student achievement and ensuring social-emotional learning is integral to the school culture. Through strategic delegation of responsibilities, each Assistant Principal (Marina Montesino, Dan Boddison, Paul Ruby, and Jocelyn Jones) is assigned an instructional content area team to monitor professional learning, collaborative planning, and track student progress.</p> <p>In sharing the responsibility for attending designated weekly team professional learning communities (PLC) meetings, Assistant Principals ensure instructional staff follows standard-based and data-driven lesson plans while meeting school-wide goals. Each is delegated to review lesson plans according to the district and school's expectations of providing rigorous and differentiated instructions.</p> <p>In tracking students, the Principal and Assistant Principals are in constant communication with the school counselors department chair (Dr. Kelli Gamez), instructional support specialist (April Goodnight), instructional staff for Migrant students (Bobby Gonzalez), instructional coaches for ELA (Maria Benedict and Lyn Saunders), Science (Kathleen Ryan), and Math (Lisa Hicks) to address concerns about students meeting grade-level expectations and share on the decision making for interventions and remediation.</p> <p>Principals and Assistant Principals are responsible for monitoring all students' grades, discipline records, graduation requirements, and provide overall instructional direction. Shared responsibility for evaluating instructional staff using the Marzano Instructional Framework/FTEM and non-instructional evaluation are part of the administrative team duties.</p> <p>The Leadership Team focuses meetings around one premise: to develop and maintain a problem-solving model to bring out the best in our school, teachers, and students.</p> <p>The team meets weekly to engage in the following activities: Review formative data and utilize results in making instructional decisions; review common formative data at each grade level and content area to identify students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources to support instructional staff. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, and evaluate implementation.</p> <p>The leadership team also facilitates the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The team coordinates with other teams (Instructional Leaders) throughout the building to assist with the</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | attainment of school-wide goals. Data results from Marzano Instructional Framework are tracked as a comparison to school-wide goals. |
| Montesino, Marina | Assistant Principal | |
| Ruby, Paul | Assistant Principal | |
| Boddison, Daniel | Assistant Principal | |
| Jones, Jocelyn | Assistant Principal | |
| Gonzalez, Bobby | Other | Resource support for Migrant students |
| Goodnight, April | Teacher, ESE | Support ESE Students |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/1/2017, Clara Calderon

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

12

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

109

Demographic Data

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |

| | |
|--|--|
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 94% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

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 | 610 | 535 | 454 | 383 | 1982 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 70 | 104 | 48 | 286 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 69 | 55 | 26 | 222 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 62 | 86 | 42 | 274 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 120 | 77 | 48 | 296 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 | 198 | 181 | 131 | 734 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 111 | 190 | 133 | 621 |

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 | 126 | 147 | 150 | 79 | 502 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 147 | 150 | 79 | 502 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 | 456 | 469 | 435 | 1925 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 90 | 118 | 84 | 393 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 101 | 113 | 48 | 359 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 133 | 147 | 88 | 526 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 246 | 254 | 168 | 929 |

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 | 143 | 138 | 159 | 73 | 513 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 32 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 | 456 | 469 | 435 | 1925 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 90 | 118 | 84 | 393 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 101 | 113 | 48 | 359 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 133 | 147 | 88 | 526 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 246 | 254 | 168 | 929 |

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 | 143 | 138 | 159 | 73 | 513 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 32 |

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 | 31% | 59% | 56% | 35% | 62% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 36% | 52% | 51% | 42% | 57% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 41% | 42% | 30% | 46% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 28% | 58% | 51% | 40% | 63% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 32% | 44% | 48% | 44% | 56% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 46% | 45% | 41% | 50% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 42% | 72% | 68% | 44% | 70% | 67% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Social Studies Achievement | 59% | 76% | 73% | 56% | 76% | 71% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09 | 2019 | 31% | 56% | -25% | 55% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 56% | -25% | 53% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 27% | 53% | -26% | 53% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 35% | 59% | -24% | 53% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| 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 | 40% | 68% | -28% | 67% | -27% |
| 2018 | 43% | 72% | -29% | 65% | -22% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |

| 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 | 62% | 72% | -10% | 70% | -8% |
| 2018 | 55% | 72% | -17% | 68% | -13% |
| Compare | | 7% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 21% | 67% | -46% | 61% | -40% |
| 2018 | 23% | 67% | -44% | 62% | -39% |
| Compare | | -2% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 31% | 59% | -28% | 57% | -26% |
| 2018 | 53% | 67% | -14% | 56% | -3% |
| Compare | | -22% | | | |

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 | 11 | 26 | 23 | 9 | 29 | 36 | 15 | 23 | | 85 | 15 |
| ELL | 6 | 33 | 35 | 15 | 29 | 33 | 12 | 20 | | 89 | 37 |
| BLK | 27 | 36 | 33 | 21 | 24 | 33 | 28 | 51 | | 96 | 38 |
| HSP | 32 | 36 | 30 | 29 | 34 | 41 | 44 | 61 | | 93 | 54 |
| WHT | | | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 36 | 30 | 28 | 32 | 40 | 42 | 59 | | 93 | 51 |

| 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 | 6 | 23 | 24 | 15 | 25 | 28 | 20 | 25 | | 69 | 21 |
| ELL | 2 | 31 | 29 | 18 | 37 | 38 | 25 | 22 | | 80 | 39 |
| BLK | 29 | 42 | 37 | 36 | 44 | 32 | 39 | 49 | | 89 | 43 |
| HSP | 36 | 42 | 28 | 41 | 44 | 44 | 46 | 57 | | 91 | 60 |
| WHT | 44 | 44 | | 23 | 30 | | | | | 94 | 60 |
| FRL | 34 | 42 | 30 | 40 | 44 | 42 | 44 | 56 | | 91 | 55 |

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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 40 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 481 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 32 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 39 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 20 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 44 |
| 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

Our lowest performing data component was in math with 28% proficiency (Algebra 21% vs 23% / Geometry 31% vs 53%).

Factors that contributed to the decline in the school year 2019 include a high number of low level 1 students and a decrease in levels 3, 4, & 5 in Algebra. Likewise in Geometry including first-year teachers unfamiliarity with curriculum, scheduling implementation, and not using instructional digital support with fidelity to differentiate instruction.

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

The data component that demonstrated the greatest decline from the prior year was math. It decreased from 40% proficiency to 28% proficiency resulting in a 12% drop (Algebra 21% and Geometry 31%). In addition, math gains decreased from 44% to 32%, resulting in a 12% drop.

Factors that contributed to the decline in the school year 2019 includes first-year teachers unfamiliarity with curriculum, struggles with classroom management, schedule implementation, and not using instructional digital support with fidelity to differentiate instruction.

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 with the greatest gap, when compared to the state average, was Algebra 1 with 21% proficiency level vs. State 61% proficiency level resulting in a 40% gap.

Factors that contributed to the decline in the school year 2019 includes first-year teachers unfamiliarity with curriculum, struggles with classroom management, schedule implementations, and not using instructional digital support with fidelity to differentiate instruction.

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

U.S. History demonstrated the most improvement with 62% SY19 vs. 55% SY18 showing proficiency with a 7% increase in achievement.

Actions attributed to this increase were teachers collaborating and standard-based lesson planning during PLC's. The use of Gateway supplemental resource first semester, PrepWorks EOC based questions as bell ringers, and USA Test Prep online program to review second-semester reinforcing standard-based instruction.

Factors that contributed to improvement were instructional staff increase the use of literacy strategies to help with vocabulary and reading comprehension.

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

Our areas of concern are the number of students with level 1 on statewide assessment and the number of students with course failure in ELA and Math. The data indicates 9th grade to be the highest in both areas.

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

1. Math proficiency
2. Math learning gains overall
3. ELA learning gains overall
4. ELA proficiency
5. Science proficiency
6. Graduation Rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Our student's achievement levels continue to lag behind the state and district average in reading as measured by the QB1, QB2, and FSA. We had a decrease in FSA reading meeting standards of 4%, not making gains of 6% but increasing 1% with students in the lowest 25% making gains. In SY20, QBA 2 9th grade remained the same at 41% but 9% below the district. In QBA2 10th grade increase 2% but 5% below the district. Migrant students achievement levels for 9th grade QB1 and QB2 in SY20 were below when compared to FSA SY19. 24% vs 29% in ELA a decrease of 5%. |
| Measureable Outcome: | To close the achievement gap, 9th and 10th graders will increase proficiency by 3% on FSA ELA by end of year assessments ensuring students are regularly and consistently engaged with grade-level core instruction and targeted monitored interventions. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Daniel Boddison (boddisda@collierschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Using District-adopted materials that align with standards will address core instructions. Students will receive daily intervention that meets their individual learning needs and adjusted based on progress monitoring data to address needed intervention |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Research indicates that to increase student achievement, instruction alignment must be standard-based and grade-level appropriate. Instructional coaches will provide job-embedded professional development to assure all instructional staff create lesson plans that are standard-based, grade-appropriate, and include high expectations. |

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted job-embedded professional development in the use of Read 180 / System 44 / USA Test Prep

Person Responsible Daniel Boddison (boddisda@collierschools.com)

Weekly collaborative planning for standard-based on grade level lessons led by instructional coaches and administration

Person Responsible Daniel Boddison (boddisda@collierschools.com)

Read 180/System 44/USA Test Prep data analysis with teachers to identify the needs of ESE and ELL students to provide intervention by both teachers and academic coaches.

Person Responsible Daniel Boddison (boddisda@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our student's achievement levels continue to lag behind the state and district average in math measured by the QB1, QB2, and FSA. We had a decrease in FSA math meeting standards of 12%, making gains of 10% and 2% with students in the lowest 25% made gains. In QBA 2, Algebra 1 had a 4% increase but 6% below the district, while Geometry had a 17% increase, which was just 4% below the district. In algebra, migrant students in both QB1 and QB2 scored below in SY20 in FSA when compared to SY19 15% vs 22% a decrease of 7%.

Measureable Outcome:

To close the achievement gap, Algebra and Geometry will increase proficiency by 3% on the Algebra and Geometry EOC by end of year assessments ensuring students are regularly and consistently engaged with grade-level core instruction and targeted monitored interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Using District-adopted materials that are aligned to standards will address core instructions. Students will receive daily intervention that meets their individual learning needs and adjusted based on progress monitoring data to address needed intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research indicates that to increase student achievement, instruction alignment must be standard-based and grade-level appropriate. Instructional coaches will provide job-embedded professional development to assure all instructional staff created lesson plans are standard-based, grade-appropriate, and include high expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

*Targeted job-embedded professional development in the use of ALEKS

Person Responsible

Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

ALEKS data analysis with teachers

Person Responsible

Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

Weekly collaborative planning for standard-based lessons, on grade level, led by instructional coaches and administration

Person Responsible

Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our student's achievement levels continue to lag behind the state and district average in biology as measured by the QB1, QB2, and EOC. We had a decrease in EOC science meeting standards of 2%. In SY20 QBA2, biology remained the same at 45% and 13% below the district. In SY20, migrant students score dropped from QB1 vs QB2 4%6 vs 61% a decrease of 15%.

Measurable Outcome: To close the achievement gap, Biology will increase proficiency by 3% on the Biology EOC assessment ensuring students are regularly and consistently engaged with grade-level core instruction and targeted monitored interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using District-adopted materials are aligned to standards will address core instructions
Students will receive daily intervention that meets their individual learning needs and is adjusted based on progress monitoring data to address needed intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that student achievement can increase by instruction that is standard-based and grade-level appropriate. Instructional coaches will provide job-embedded professional development to assure all instructional staff created lesson plans that are standard-based, grade-appropriate, and include high expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted job-embedded professional development in the use of USA TEST Prep.

Person Responsible Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

USA Test Prep data analysis with teachers.

Person Responsible Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

Weekly collaborative planning for standard-based lessons, on grade level, led by instructional coaches and administration.

Person Responsible Marina Montesino (montem6@collierschools.com)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our graduation rate in 2019 dropped from 93% to 86% making it 5% below the district of 91%. In 2019 IHS Migrant student graduation was 88.4%, a 5.6% dropped from 2018 migrant students graduation rate of 94%.

Measureable Outcome: By the end of the school year 2020, IHS at-risk students will have met credit and GPA requirements to meet graduation requirements, increasing the graduation rate by 2%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Clara Calderon (caldercl@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: To meet graduation requirements, credit recovery programs allow high school students to recover course credit for classes previously failed and thereby improve GPA. The school will continue to support students with a credit recovery program to meet graduation requirements. Students identified as having failed a course by their counselor will take the course during the school day. Monitoring passing and checking for content understanding will be tracked by a resource teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that an online credit recovery is a tool used to help at-risk-students to recover course credit and meet graduation requirements. The implementation of such a program requires monitoring and tracking students' completion ability. IHS has a high number of students that without this program, would not be able to meet graduation requirements.

Action Steps to Implement

The principal will have an annual meeting with at-risk 12th-grade students to review status towards graduation requirements.

The administrative team will have quarterly data chats and progress monitoring with counselors to review at-risk students status towards graduation requirements

Person Responsible Clara Calderon (caldercl@collierschools.com)

School Counselors will meet quarterly with at risk 12th-grade students to progress, monitor grades, and meeting graduation requirements. Information from the meeting is presented to the Leadership Team to review, arrange for support, and provide in-class intervention coordination.

Person Responsible Clara Calderon (caldercl@collierschools.com)

Migrant resource teachers will meet quarterly with at risk migrant 12th-grade students to progress monitor grades and meeting graduation requirements. As a dropout prevention program for migrant students, students will participate in the IHS Earn and Learn program to help support elementary age student during reading block, earn money to help support families, and remain in school.

Person Responsible Bobby Gonzalez (gonzalc2@collierschools.com)

ESE Program Specialist will meet quarterly with ESE inclusion teachers to review grades of ESE students.

The administration will meet with ESE Specialist and ESE inclusion teacher to review 12th-grade student's progress monitoring grades and to meet graduation requirements.

Person Responsible April Goodnight (goodniap@collierschools.com)

Credit Recovery Resource teachers will meet weekly with students to establish data chat and ownership of progress monitoring.

Administrators will meet with the Resource teacher to review at-risk student's progress towards meeting graduation requirements.

Person Responsible Daniel Boddison (boddisda@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All areas identified in 2E of the Needs Assessment Analysis have been addressed as part of the school-wide improvement priorities.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Immokalee High School is a school with long-established ties to the community. Organizations and partnerships consist of parent support for student athletics events, student clubs, and community service programs.

The school builds and sustains partnerships with the following community-based programs: The Immokalee Foundation (TIF) mentoring students through the Take Stock for Kids Program, One by One Leadership and mentoring at-risk students, Guadalupe Center mentoring program, and Six-Years From Now (6YFN) enrichment and after-school program, Miracle University developing high school students to become mentors to elementary and middle school students of Immokalee. All are working together to impact student achievement. Local colleges and universities provide interns throughout the school year, which helps increase IHS

instructional resources to support the school and student achievement. IHS lends its campus and students to volunteer in social service programs that serve community partners' events. Communication is the key to increase parent involvement. Through flyers(in English, Spanish, and Creole), handouts (in English, Spanish, and Creole), website, Facebook, Twitter, student email, marquee, and automatic phone messaging (in English, Spanish, and Creole), parents receive information about School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, District Advisory meetings, Title I Annual program meeting, Open House, Upcoming assessments, College Readiness/Financial Aid Night, and educational parent workshops.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$502,262.57 |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|-----|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$161,229.12 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Academic Reading Coach: L. Saunders / M. Benedict</i> | | | |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$94,294.75 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Migrant Resource English Teacher: T. Lopez Bilingual Para Professional : C. Clermont</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 150-Aides | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$209,821.88 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ELL Creole Tutors : F. Dumay / 1 TBD ELL Spanish Tutors: E. Gallegos Hernandez/ 2 TBD Bilingual Paraprofessional ELL: Carline Clermont</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,497.78 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional materials supplemental resource Gateway US History (1500) Classroom supplies: notebooks/ copy paper / instructional office supplies (2997.78)</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$10,290.16 |
| | | | <i>Notes: After school program instructional support (3 teachers, 2 days per week, 2 hours pe day, 35 weeks)</i> | | | |
| | 7300 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,466.07 |
| | | | <i>Notes: After school program non-instructional support to provide clerical demands of program.</i> | | | |
| | 7800 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$7,390.67 |
| | | | <i>Notes: After school program bus transportation</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 369-Technology-Related Rentals | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$1,340.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: USA Test Prep online school subscription (US History/ Biology / Geometry)</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|--|-----------------|-----|---------------------|
| | 5900 | 150-Aides | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$8,932.14 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Academic Intervention after school support for students. Tribal Success Remediation Program, homework support (1 tutors , 2 days per week, 2 hour per day -35 weeks)</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$157,472.29 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$100,056.23 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Academic Math Coach: L. Hicks</i> | | | |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$57,416.06 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Migrant Math Resource Teacher: F. Omonte</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$151,699.08 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$72,284.60 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Academic Science Coach: K. Ryan</i> | | | |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$79,414.48 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Migrant Science Resource Teacher: M. Ramirez</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation | | | | \$224,340.94 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$102,575.07 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Credit Recovery Resource Teacher: J. Kendall</i> | | | |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$92,678.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Migrant Dropout Prevention Resource Teacher: C. Gonzalez</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 750-Other Personal Services | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$19,646.71 |
| | | | <i>Notes: The Migrant Earn & Learn Program provides after school employment to high school students who are at-risk of dropping out. 12-13 migrant students will work 3 hours a day for 5 days a week.</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 390-Other Purchased Services | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Fingerprints for migrant students participating in the Earn & Learn Program</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,100.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Food, refreshments, and supplies for parent workshops/meeting.</i> | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|-----------------------|
| 6150 | 390-Other Purchased Services | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$3,200.00 |
| | | <i>Notes: Production and distribution of documents to promote family engagement at school events (magnets) per household</i> | | | |
| 6150 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part A | | \$1,141.16 |
| | | <i>Notes: Staff support for translation services.</i> | | | |
| 7800 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0271 - Immokalee High School | Title, I Part C | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | <i>Notes: Migrant staff will chaperone and transport migrant students to FGCU Fort Myers, USF Tampa and FIU & Miami Dade Homestead in a safe, efficient and timely manner to local universities and colleges so that they can learn about the various educational opportunities and gain understanding of college programs and campus life. (school bus)</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | \$1,035,774.88 |