Edward H. White High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edward H. White High School

1700 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD N, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/edwhite

Demographics

Principal: Traci Battest

Start Date for this Principal: 2/19/2018

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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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

Edward H. White High School

1700 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD N, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/edwhite

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	Yes	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

To provide an environment that promotes academic excellence, inspires leadership, and strengthens physical, mental, social and emotional well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for Edward H. White High School students to be prepared for success as well-rounded leaders through rigorous instruction, enrichment activities, respectful interaction, effective discipline and community service

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
Battest, Traci	Principal	
Wright, Dishon	Assistant Principal	
Reising, Abraham	Assistant Principal	
Wells-Young, Tiara	Dean	
Robinson, Alexia	Instructional Coach	
Terrell, Anastasia	Administrative Support	

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	468	455	295	302	1520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	12	3	4	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	142	40	14	222
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238	203	110	104	655

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	72	14	2	4	92

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	22	4	1	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	12

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
85

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/28/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	183	158	0	530
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	99	43	34	317
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	51	30	23	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	114	143	0	367

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	116	79	39	73	307

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	34%	47%	56%	23%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	48%	51%	34%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	42%	42%	35%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	39%	51%	51%	48%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	40%	52%	48%	50%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	45%	55%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	52%	65%	68%	53%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	70%	73%	52%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	468 (0)	455 (0)	295 (0)	302 (0)	1520 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	55 ()	12 ()	3 ()	4 ()	74 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	26 (0)	142 (0)	40 (0)	14 (0)	222 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	238 (0)	203 (0)	110 (0)	104 (0)	655 (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	29%	48%	-19%	55%	-26%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	35%	48%	-13%	53%	-18%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	67%	-18%	67%	-18%
2018	49%	63%	-14%	65%	-16%
Compare		0%			

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	51%	68%	-17%	70%	-19%
2018	52%	64%	-12%	68%	-16%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	57%	-33%	61%	-37%
2018	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
Compare		-25%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	61%	-20%	57%	-16%
2018	37%	57%	-20%	56%	-19%
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	26	27	28	35	32	29	39	44		85	49
ELL	14	24	14	33			27	42			
ASN	52	52		71	64		70	73		95	95
BLK	28	37	26	34	39	45	47	50		91	76
HSP	33	25	13	34	12		45	56		91	75
MUL	42	52		50			73			85	82
WHT	47	51	62	48	47	45	64	67		82	83
FRL	31	37	28	39	40	41	51	49		88	77

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	31	45	37	39	45		45	46		75	21
ELL	9	36	30								
ASN	50	52		45	50					92	100
BLK	27	46	43	39	48	40	43	43		89	70
HSP	40	48	33	54	67		58	48		89	56
MUL	35	50		31				82		70	
WHT	50	50	32	58	67		72	80		72	63
FRL	32	46	41	44	55	45	49	51		84	65

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	9	32	25	30	48	33	30	23		49	59
ELL	13	31									
ASN	36	38		55				80			
BLK	18	32	32	44	50	59	46	46		81	77
HSP	30	38	50	74	68		80	58		80	85
MUL	17	22		38	27		36	70		100	90
WHT	33	40	40	52	50	33	64	57		71	75
FRL	21	34	31	48	54	57	50	43		75	81

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	72
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	47
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	43
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	60
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	48
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.

The lowest performing data component was Algebra 1 at 24% proficiency. Last year, many of the students coming into Algebra 1 from 1-A had a long-term/permanent sub the year prior in Algebra 1-A. These students proportionally made up a significant part of the denominator for Algebra 1 proficiency. Of the near 50 students that entered into Algebra 1 as proficient based on prior year test scores did not maintain or increase their proficiency.

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

The greatest decline from prior year was math, specifically Algebra 1 proficiency and overall math learning gains. The main cause of this was students that were proficient the year prior not maintaining or increasing proficiency, especially students who had a proficiency level of 4 or 5 for the year prior. This had a doubly significant impact, both on proficiency rates and rates of student gain.

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 greatest gap between our scores and the state average is in ELA achievement. Although over the past 3 years we have shown a gradual increase in ELA proficiency, we took a step backwards this year. Two 10th grade ELA teachers had significant time spent on medical leave last school year.

There were efforts to recover this lapse in continuity through the use of the instructional coach, but the teachers absence still had a significant impact. This gap can also be understood, but not justified, through the gaps consistent with serving a demographic of low socioeconomic students.

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

Geometry went up 4% from the year prior in proficiency, showing the most improvement. This can be attributed to having a set of seasoned teachers in the classrooms for Geometry. There was also a greater amount of intentional cohorting with students who entered Geometry with proficiency.

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

The primary area of concern based on Early Warning data is the high number and percentage of students that have achieved a 1 on at least one of the state assessments.

Another significant concern is the number of students at or below 90% attendance rate, with the greatest concern with 9th grade.

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

1. Increase Math Gains (Including LBQ)
2 Increase ELA Gains (Including LBQ)
3. Increase ELA Proficiency, with a focus on 10th grade to satisfy graduation requirement
4.Increase Math Proficiency, with a focus on Algebra 1 to satisfy graduation requirement
5. Continue to grow a climate of learning, reflecting, and collaborative improvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math learning gains
Rationale	2018-2019 received a significant decrease in Math Gains of 14%. Understanding that students scheduled into ALG-1 and GEO are initially proficient because they all have a previous FSA Score.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We are expecting a 4 point growth in every sub group. There is a requirement of 35 points to reach the next grade of a B (536).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dishon Wright (mayhewtd@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	A Math Teacher position will be used to specifically address bottom quartile of Algebra 1 students. This teacher will coordinate with the instructional coach to plan effective instructional practices. We will supervise instructional practices by monitoring instruction through class-based rotations by the leadership team, specific targeted walkthroughs, providing intentional professional development sessions prescribed from walkthrough data, and initiating collegial conversations that offers meaningful feedback to our faculty and supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our proficient-only students are scheduled into cohorts as well: In Math, Alg-1 (students with a previous year in Alg-1A) and Geo (students with a previous year in MCR) In Math, Alg-1 (students with a previous year of Alg-1A and real-time data from PGMBy cohorting these students, the leadership team will be able to visit, observe, and track them with greater frequency and accuracy. This will also allow us to identify students that are multi-buckets across curriculum areas. Furthermore, this will allow counselors to track and meet with these students with greater frequency.

Action Step	
Description	1. We will schedule (4s and 5s) into cohort classes. 2. Our instructional coach will provide professional development in high-yield instructional strategies across all accountability areas. 3. She will intentionally focus on skill building and high-level questioning, including tiered interventions, small groups, and mentoring specific Algebra teachers. 4. Most of our students who earned (4s and 5s) are scheduled into intensive math, our testing coordinator will serve as interventionist and will focus on our ELL students as one of tiers of intervention. 5. We will introduce instructional strategies to engage Level 4 and 5 students, such as pull out into small groups with our support personnel, pushing in classes and mentoring teachers.
Person Responsible	Dishon Wright (mayhewtd@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Reading BQ learning gains
Rationale	Our ELA students in the BQ performed 10% lower than in 2017. Reading affects all accountability areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We are expecting a 4 point growth in every sub group. There is a requirement of 35 points to reach the next grade of a B (536).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Traci Battest (rogerst3@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	An Instructional Coach position will be used to design, monitor and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers. We will supervise instructional practices by monitoring instruction through class-based rotations by the leadership team, specific targeted walkthroughs, providing intentional professional development sessions prescribed from walkthrough data, and initiating collegial conversations that offers meaningful feedback to our faculty and supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We can gauge instruction to receive an immediate idea of deficiencies that can be addressed through professional development. We scheduled students to ensure that all seniors have earned or are scheduled in a SLS, Digital Design, ENC1101, AP Computer Science, or a course that is applicable to their unique academic record. Freshmen are scheduled into a CTE core course that provides a track to an industry certification. We provide ENC 1101, 1102, and SLS through FSCJ and EWC to our juniors with FSA pass scores and college ready scores. By cohorting these students, the leadership team will be able to visit, observe, and track them with greater frequency and accuracy. This will also allow us to identify students that are multi-buckets across curriculum areas. Furthermore, this will allow counselors to track and meet with these students with greater frequency.

Action Step	
Description	1. Our cohorted students will receive strategic interventions from the instructional coach through pullouts, tiered strategies, and ELA teachers will receive data-driven professional development. The data will be derived from focused walkthroughs. 2. We are implementing an AVID approach to instruction with a schoolwide focus on vocabulary strategies, text marking/questioning, and evidence-based writing. 3. Each teacher will know which students are in an accountability bucket, specifically 3 and 2 bucket students. 4. Administrators will model data analysis techniques with teachers. 5. The instructional coach will form groups of bubble students in the gain buckets. These are students within 10 points of the next proficiency level. 6. We are only assigning teachers into reading and SAT/ACT prep courses that have a track record of academic success.
Person Responsible	Traci Battest (rogerst3@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Reading proficiency
Rationale	Our Reading proficiency was 8 points lower than in 2018. Reading affects all accountability areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We are expecting a 4 point growth in every sub group. There is a requirement of 35 points to reach the next grade of a B (536).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	An Instructional Coach position will be used to design, monitor and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers. We will supervise instructional practices by monitoring instruction through class-based rotations by the leadership team, specific targeted walkthroughs, providing intentional professional development sessions prescribed from walkthrough data, and initiating collegial conversations that offers meaningful feedback to our faculty and supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We can gauge instruction to receive an immediate idea of deficiencies that can be addressed through professional development. We scheduled students to ensure that all seniors have earned or are scheduled in a SLS, Digital Design, ENC1101, AP Computer Science, or a course that is applicable to their unique academic record. Freshmen are scheduled into a CTE core course that provides a track to an industry certification. We provide ENC 1101, 1102, and SLS through FSCJ and EWC to our juniors with FSA pass scores and college ready scores. By cohorting these students, the leadership team will be able to visit, observe, and track them with greater frequency and accuracy. This will also allow us to identify students that are multi-buckets across curriculum areas. Furthermore, this will allow counselors to track and meet with these students with greater frequency.

Action Step	
Description	1. We will schedule 9th and 10th ELA BQ students into cohorts. Our cohorted students will receive strategic interventions from the instructional coach through pullouts, tiered strategies, and ELA teachers will receive data-driven professional development. The data will be derived from focused walkthroughs. 2. We are only assigning teachers into reading and SAT/ACT prep courses that have a track record of academic success. 3. We are implementing an AVID approach to instruction with a schoolwide focus on vocabulary strategies, text marking/questioning, and evidence-based writing. 4. Administrators will model data analysis techniques with teachers. Each teacher will know which students are in an accountability bucket, specifically 3 and 2 bucket students. 5. The instructional coach will form groups of bubble students in the gain buckets. These are students within 10 points of the next proficiency level.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

• We will provide parenting workshops related to health, safety, communication, and academic achievement based on the needs assessment and unique needs of the parents of the students in the school.
• We will hold school and community-based meetings to help parents understand school needs and expectations at different levels of the educational process.
• We have established and will maintain partnerships with businesses, faith-based organizations, and community agencies in order to provide training on effective parenting skills.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Ed White, a Community Partnership School, will soon be the hub of our community. The goal is to increase student success at school by providing access to resources to improve physical and emotional health, increase parental involvement, and empower students to shine. Through the Children's Home Society of Florida, we will provide site access to health and wellness services such as counseling, leadership opportunities,cultural enrichment activities after-school activities, and Parent Resource Centers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Last year we established relationships with each feeder middle school to ensure 8th graders have a seamless transition. This will include the Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Magnet Coordinator reviewing our expectations as well as academic requirements at the beginning of the school year. We will also attend transition fairs and host middle schools for fairs and tours through out the school year.

There are a number of programs that are in place to assist our outgoing seniors.
- Internship availability with local businesses
- PERT/ACT/SAT prep courses
- Parent/student FAFSA nights
- College Fairs
- Job prep workshops
- Job Fairs

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school improvement plan encompasses both qualitative and quantitative information that focuses on areas need for content areas, as well as specific student populations. Data for this plan is gathered from baseline testing, teachers, Gallup surveys and other district-wide information. The school's leadership team consists of the principal, assistant principals, academic coach, academic deans, and integrated community partners. The team reviews student progress data to develop interventions & strategies that promote overall student success. When a student is identified that may benefit from available resources provided from the school, the child is added to the current weeks MTSS roster and discussed at the time of the meeting.

MTSS meetings are held every Thursday, and during this time, the team discusses the overall academic and behavior progress of an identified at-risk students who would benefit from an action plan. Utilizing the MTSS four-step problem-solving process, the area of need is identified, and an action plan is designed to target each deficient area. The school leadership team manages this process.

In addition to the collaborative leadership among the school's leadership team, community partners provide resources such as staffing, funding, and support to assist with identified at-risk youth. Community partners are available to participate in school-related meetings, and during this time, partners are included in the action plan. These resources are maintained by the designated agency's partner point of contact.

Federal funding such as Title-I allows for the school leadership team to host informational sessions with families of identified youth to ensure the best academic outcome overall. Informational such as "Facts on Feast," provides parents quantitative date to so that they are also well versed in how decisions at the school are finalized in-regards to their students. These resources are maintained and managed with the school's leadership team.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

There are a number of programs that are in place to assist our outgoing seniors.
- Internship availability with local businesses
- PERT/ACT/SAT prep courses
- Parent/student FAFSA nights
- College Fairs
- Job prep workshops
- Job Fairs

More specifically, we have a partnership with UPS for our seniors this year(career), a military magnet track where leadership skills are taught (military awareness), and college visits and fairs.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math learning gains	$58,035.60

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A		$42,300.00
	5100	200-Employee Benefits	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A		$15,735.60
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Reading BQ learning gains**				**$29,017.50**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2481 - Edward H. White High School	General Fund		$29,017.50
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Reading proficiency**				**$29,017.50**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2481 - Edward H. White High School	General Fund		$29,017.50
					Total:	**$116,070.60**