University High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

University High School

1000 W RHODE ISLAND AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://www.uhstitans.com/

Demographics

Principal: Karen Chenoweth

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2015

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Volusia 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.

Table of Contents

University High School

1000 W RHODE ISLAND AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://www.uhstitans.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At University High School we believe in the promise of every student. We are committed to preparing students for success in a rapidly changing world. Together we are a vibrant, close-knit learning community of diverse backgrounds, talent and perspectives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In concurrence with Volusia County's vision statement, "Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society."

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Julian	Principal	The school-based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress. * Principal (Dr. Jones)- monitors school-wide data and instructional focus and every aspect of the school * Assistant Principal of Curriculum (Melissa Fraine) - monitors Professional Learning Community work, provides assistance with data analysis and coordinates the school's professional development plan * Data Assistant Principal (Mr. Boles)- monitors the early warning system reports, monitors data progress with student overall numbers, master schedule and makes recommendations for adjustments in the School Improvement Plan * Literacy Coach - implements professional development for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing FAIR, FSA, EOC and Volusia Writes data to determine student placement in appropriate course and coordinates the school-wide literacy plan * Department Chairs - provide content specific professional development, reviews and provides feedback on the school literacy and school-wide professional development plans * Math Coach - implements professional development for math teachers, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing common assessments, DIAs, SMT, EOCs data, is in classrooms daily modeling and providing best-practices feedback
Boles, Chester	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant Principal - monitors the early warning system reports, monitors data progress with student overall numbers, master schedule, oversees guidance, evaluates teachers, facilitator for Social Studies PLC, and makes recommendations for adjustments in the School Improvement Plan
Carter, Ben	Assistant Principal	Assistance Principal of facilities and discipline. Oversees advisors, facilities, English 3 & 4 PLC, Foreign Language PLC, evaluates teachers, and in charge of discipline.
Fraine, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistance Principal of curriculum. Oversees curriculum needs, teachers, facilitates English 1 & 2 PLC, AVID PLC, New Teacher Program, interns,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		evaluates teachers, Career Colleges, AVID, Cambridge, Professional Learning, SIP, ILT, all PLCs and in charge of testing.
Hughes, Jennie	Assistant Principal	Assistance Principal of students with Exceptionalities. Oversees IEPs, compliance, evaluates teachers, and in charge of all ESE programs including co-taught.
Berner, Linda	Instructional Coach	* Literacy Coach - implements professional development for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing FAIR, FSA, EOC and Volusia Writes data to determine student placement in appropriate course and coordinates the school-wide literacy plan, member of Instructional Leadership Team
Goode, Mindy	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and AVID Director. Member of Instructional Leadership Team
KELLEHER, SUSAN	Dean	Administrative TOA of discipline, security, and testing. Member of Instructional Leadership Team
Lastowski, William	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Biology teacher, Science Department Chair, and Cambridge Director. Member of Instructional Leadership Team
Marracino, Laura	School Counselor	Director of Guidance and member of Instructional Leadership Team
McKenzie, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	English 1 and Cambridge classroom teacher. Department Chair English 1 & 2. Member of Instructional Leadership Team
McNairy, Cindy	Instructional Coach	Math Coach - implements professional development for math teachers, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing common assessments, DIAs, SMT, EOCs data, is in classrooms daily modeling and providing best-practices feedback, Member of Instructional Leadership Team
Myers, Michael	Instructional Coach	Algebra 2 classroom teacher, member of Instructional leadership Team, and math department chair.
O'Quinn, Amy	Dean	Administrative TOA of testing, discipline, SAC, facilitator of science PLCs.
Ouellette, Christina	Teacher, K-12	English 4 classroom teacher, member of Instructional Leadership Team, and English 3 & 4 Department Chair.
Peel, Jennifer	Instructional Technology	DLTL of School, Career College and Academy Director, CTE Director

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roman, Orlando	Teacher, K-12	Guitar Classroom teacher, member of Instructional Leadership Team, arts Department Chair
Ruggiero, Joe	Teacher, K-12	Economics and AP Macro classroom teacher, member of Instructional Leadership Team, and Social Studies Department Chair
Lubbers, John	Teacher, K-12	ROTC Classroom teacher and director, member of Instructional Leadership Team
Amaro, Leslie	Teacher, ESE	IEP Facilitator, ESE Department Chair, and member of Instructional Leadership Team
Norton, Amber	Teacher, K-12	Dance Classroom Teacher, SAC Chair, PST Chair

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785	739	614	528	2666
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	117	83	108	443
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5	5	3	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	175	175	155	583
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	294	218	147	105	764

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	152	93	77	449

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	100	72	12	265
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	7	22

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

141

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/10/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	92	52	12	268
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	92	52	12	268

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	96	54	14	277

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	52%	56%	49%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	49%	51%	48%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	37%	42%	39%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	50%	48%	51%	59%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	49%	48%	48%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	38%	45%	39%	34%	39%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	78%	76%	68%	62%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	69%	73%	76%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	785 (0)	739 (0)	614 (0)	528 (0)	2666 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	135 ()	117 ()	83 ()	108 ()	443 (0)
One or more suspensions	30 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	43 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	78 (0)	175 (0)	175 (0)	155 (0)	583 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	294 (0)	218 (0)	147 (0)	105 (0)	764 (0)

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	51%	50%	1%	53%	-2%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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	77%	72%	5%	67%	10%
2018	61%	65%	-4%	65%	-4%
Compare		16%			

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	72%	63%	9%	70%	2%
2018	68%	63%	5%	68%	0%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
2018	34%	57%	-23%	62%	-28%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%
2018	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
Compare		4%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	32	21	26	40	29	37	45		75	9
ELL	24	40	35	40	42	33	58	54		67	35
ASN	44	55		53	60		73			92	83
BLK	44	47	41	37	37	33	64	57		72	31
HSP	46	46	34	50	47	30	78	67		75	39
MUL	50	45	27	44	31		73	85		84	69
WHT	55	50	32	52	53	43	80	78		80	52
FRL	43	46	34	47	47	37	71	69		72	39

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	43	42	22	44	34	18	35		64	13
ELL	17	47	45	31	61	59	22	37		53	29
ASN	59	54		67							
BLK	32	42	38	35	43	37	57	64		79	33
HSP	46	47	45	42	51	49	58	63		78	42
MUL	62	55		58	64		64	77		83	32
WHT	57	53	52	52	58	48	80	79		77	50
FRL	43	47	43	44	53	47	61	68		72	36
2017 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	12	32	34	25	39	13	34	48		66	16
ELL	11	27	27	25	42	36	32	56		69	24
ASN	78	50		80	79		85			92	100
BLK	28	39	43	38	43	36	41	61		77	27
HSP	40	44	33	52	44	46	53	73		79	36
MUL	70	56		85	58		89	85		81	35
WHT	55	52	41	63	49	35	68	80		80	49
FRL	42	44	36	52	47	36	56	73		75	33

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 underperforming subgroup is our students with disabilities with a 34% of ESSA points earned. We also had other subgroups that did not perform up to our desire , but our lowest performing group was our ESE population. It was our first year implementing the co-taught model, and we experienced some growing pains with engagement as well as teacher retention in this area. We had some successful instructional models within co-taught classrooms, but we didn't see the embracement and desired growth. Our focus has been on training, coaching, collaborating, and modeling as we enter the new school year.

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

Our bottom quartile in both ELA and math had great declines. UHS had a 13% decline in ELA dropping from a 47 to 34 and 10% decline in math from a 47 to a 37. Our English Language Learners had a drastic drop in bottom quartile -10% in ELA and -25% in math. Students with disabilities had a 21% decline in ELA. White population had a 20% decline in ELA for the bottom quartile. The performance of these subgroups have a direct impact on our overall underperformance of our bottom quartile. UHS lost their ESOL director, one of the three ESOL teachers midyear, and three of our ELA co-teachers resulting in substitute teachers delivering instruction. We are currently fully staffed with qualified teachers and have a math coach for instructional support .

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.

Overall percentage of points proves that our SWD had a point spread from 34% with to 58% non-SWD within our school for a difference of 24. ELA had a 37 point gap, math 29, and science 47% gap.
Compared to the district average in 9th grade ELA we were 2 points behind the district and 6% less than the state. UHS lowest quartiles in ELA and math were lower than both the district and the state. Algebra 1 was our greatest gap compared to the state 21% less than the district and 28% lower than the district. Our scores in Algebra 1 were aligned with the previous year. We started implementing data driven PLCs last year and have a very thorough plan in place for this school year as we build upon the foundations laid last year. Additionally, we now have a math coach and all Algebra teachers are located on the same floor as the coach for daily support and instructional growth.

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

UHS is very proud of our growth and leading the district in Geometry. Additionally, our science and Social studies students performed above the district and science outperformed the state average by 10%. Our students continue to show learning gains in all core subjects. Science used a very intense remediation program lead by our PLC facilitator to help students achieve mastery and success. Our geometry PLC was standard and data driven and very thorough in analysis to determine student needs and interventions. They used common assessments and collaboration to grow teacher efficacy and increase student achievement.

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

According to our EWS, major areas of concern are:
* Attendance below 90& - 443 students with over half of those in 9th and 10th grade.
* 583 students failed ELA or math courses
*764 students scored a Level 1 on state assessments

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA bottom quartile
2. Increase student achievement in Math bottom quartile.
3. Improve our co-teaching practices to produce a more cohesive environment and to better serve our SWD.
4. Increase ELL student growth and achievement.
5. Graduation Assurance with implementation of Career Colleges, PLCs, GradPlan, Cambridge, CTE Certifications, and student engagement using school-wide AVID strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
Rationale	Our bottom quartile in both ELA and math had significant declines. UHS had a 13% decline in ELA dropping from a 47 to 34 overall. Our English Language Learners had a drop in bottom quartile -10% in ELA and students with disabilities had a 21% decline. White population had a 20% decline in ELA for the bottom quartile. The performance of these subgroups have a direct impact on our overall under-performance of our bottom quartile.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase from 34% to at least 50% of our students in the lowest quartile making learning gains for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julian Jones (jfjones@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement co-taught model and provide continuous and well planned training, modeling, and coaching for teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research proves the value of having two professionals share the teaching responsibilities to better meet the needs of students through differentiation, time with students, additional support, and different teaching approaches increases student performance. Research shows that SWD benefited from teachers working together to make the curriculum more accessible to all students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Create a master schedule with common planning for departments and co-taught teams. 2. The schedule is communicated to staff 3. Training and implementation start during pre-planning for co-taught models. District specialists are involved in monthly training for ELA teachers for Gen. ED, ESE, and co-taught. 4. ILT determines the FOCUS for training each month. 5. Teachers are trained to identify lowest quartile, access data using common assessments, analyze performance by standards, determine remediation, reassess, and follow through with continuous monitoring of student progress. Data Walls are a living area where teachers analyze, discuss student progress, share instructional ideas, plan, and reflect. Teachers are trained in 5 models of co-teaching during monthly trainings, learning walks, and modeling. 6. Administration and support teams are in classes weekly for drop-ins, IPG Walks, learning walks, and school wide data walks. Coaches have a targeted group of co-teachers to give feedback and support daily.
Person Responsible	Melissa Fraine (mdfraine@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
Rationale	University High School had a 10% decline in our math bottom quartile from a 47 to a 37 overall. Our English Language Learners had a drastic drop in the lowest quartile -25% in math. Students with disabilities had a 5% decline in math and the white population had a 5% decline for the bottom quartile. The performance of these subgroups have a direct impact on our overall underperformance of our bottom quartile.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase from 37% to 50% of our students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in Math for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cindy McNairy (cemcnair@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) using standard based data, instruction, and administrative support through FOCUS PLCs and data walls.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Dufours research is noted for developing strategies to create collaborative teaching environments and increase teacher efficacy. DeFour linked increases in student achievement to schools where there was a shared vision of leadership (administrative support in FOCUS PLCs), where each member of the learning community contributed, and where teachers collectively planned, reflected, and analyzed data to drive instruction and remediation.

Action Step	
Description	1. Create a master schedule of when PLCs and training will occur with common planning for departments. 2. The schedule is communicated to staff 3. Training and implementation start during pre-planning for PLCs. and standards based instruction. District specialists are involved in training for math teachers for Gen. ED and ESE. 4. ILT determines the FOCUS for support PLCs and training. This results in monthly training for PLC facilitators. 5. Teachers are trained to identify lowest quartile, access data using common assessments, analyze performance by standards, determine remediation, reassess, and follow through with continuous monitoring of student progress. Data Walls are a living area where teachers analyze, discuss student progress, share instructional ideas, plan, and reflect. Teachers are trained during monthly PL, learning walks, and modeling. 6. Administration and support team are in classes weekly for drop ins, IPG Walks, learning walks, and school wide data walks and coaches have a targeted group of teachers to give feedback and support daily.
Person Responsible	Melissa Fraine (mdfraine@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Graduation Rate
Rationale	Graduation rates reflect continuous focus on student success. UHS has a graduation rate of 78%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase graduation rate by 4% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chester Boles (cboles@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	University will implement Career Colleges for the 2019-2020 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on research by MDRC, Career Academies were developed with the aim of restructuring large high schools into small learning communities and creating better pathways from high school to further education and the workplace. The proliferation of Career Academies, along with their continuing relevance to high school reform policy initiatives at the federal, state, and local levels, has been fueled by MDRC's random assignment evaluation of the model. This study tracked a sample of students for 12 years and found strong and sustained impacts on their labor market outcomes. Research proved the model promoted increased attendance, student engagement, student success, and increased graduation rate. ACTE research shows that taking one CTE class for every two academic classes minimizes the risk of students dropping out of school. The average high school graduation rate for students concentrating in programs is 93 percent, compared to an average national graduation rate of 80 percent.

Action Step	
Description	1. University created 4 Career Colleges with 22 majors within. It was presented to teachers and they were asked to choose the Career College they would like to be a part of. Teachers filled out a survey with their choice. 2. Career Colleges are organized with CTE teachers, Core teachers, an AVID teacher, and elective teachers 3. Students choose the Career College they will be a part of. 4. PLCs are defined for Career Colleges and CTE teachers are trained as leads. 5. Monthly Career Focus Units are established for cross-curricular learning, and monthly AVID strategies are taught for engagement and instructional practices. AVID is a common thread across Colleges. 6. Each College submits bi-weekly reports of their progress on projects, student progress, attendance issues, and student profile pieces. 7. Administration and support team are in classes weekly for drop ins, IPG Walks, learning walks, and school wide data walks.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Peel (jmpeel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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