

Hernando County School District

Weeki Wachee High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Weeki Wachee High School

12150 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwhs>

Demographics

Principal: Ed Larose

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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)	85%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Hernando 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Weeki Wachee High School

12150 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwhs>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>78%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>30%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Where all members of the school community are responsible for ensuring learning and academic achievement for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Weeki Wachee High School, we're all about students. Where all students make a years worth of growth.

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
La Barbara, Troy	Principal	Mr. LaBarbara serves as the instructional leader who works with faculty and staff regularly to identify needs, set and monitor goals. In addition, he is the safety leader who works to ensure that all have a safe work environment. He oversees all operations of the school.
Burgess, Laura	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kane oversees professional development, school improvement, the Reading Department, the ELA Department, the Science Department, and the Fine Arts Department. She also serves on the safety team and handles student discipline.
Shelby, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Shelby oversees MTSS, the Math Department, CTE, and the Social Science Department. She also serves on the safety team and handles student discipline.
Swihart, Stacey	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Swihart oversees School Safety, the ESE Department, the PE Department and the Guidance Department. She also handles student discipline.
Adesso, Lore	Teacher, K-12	Assessment Coordinator
Clark, Damien	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Social Science
Clark, Summer	School Counselor	Department Chair, Guidance
Jordan, T.J.	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Science
Mihok, Kirsten	Teacher, ESE	Department Chair, Exceptional Student Education
Dejesus, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Math
Ross, Charlene	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Math
Maternowski, Adam	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair. Social Science
Quarto, Mike	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Reading
Linauer, Marlise	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, World Languages
Skipper, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Career and Technical Education
Bouchard, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, ELA 11 & 12

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Campbell, Roxanne	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Fine Arts
Jones, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair, Physical Education

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	0	330	284	282	334	1230
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	10	19	16	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	30	1	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	72	58	48	257

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	0	137	95	107	115	454

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	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	32	44	48	245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	12	11	16	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	45	51	57	175
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	31	0	0	83

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	145	100	104	149	498

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	121	32	44	48	245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	12	11	16	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	45	51	57	175
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	31	0	0	83

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	145	100	104	149	498

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	45%	49%	56%	36%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	45%	51%	36%	43%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	36%	42%	30%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	50%	51%	51%	50%	49%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	45%	48%	40%	40%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	38%	45%	31%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	65%	68%	68%	58%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	71%	73%	63%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	330 (0)	284 (0)	282 (0)	334 (0)	1230 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (121)	1 (32)	1 (44)	2 (48)	5 (245)
One or more suspensions	28 (26)	10 (12)	19 (11)	16 (16)	73 (65)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (22)	30 (45)	1 (51)	0 (57)	40 (175)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	79 (52)	72 (31)	58 (0)	48 (0)	257 (83)

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	39%	51%	-12%	55%	-16%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

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	62%	67%	-5%	67%	-5%
2018	52%	58%	-6%	65%	-13%
Compare		10%			

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	70%	70%	0%	70%	0%
2018	55%	68%	-13%	68%	-13%
Compare		15%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	59%	-19%	61%	-21%
2018	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%
2018	37%	45%	-8%	56%	-19%
Compare		21%			

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	30	44	33	31	40	34	24	44		96	36
ELL	24	45	50	18	35		40			100	43
BLK	39	47	33	26	31	24	47	36		100	45
HSP	34	37	28	44	41	25	53	66		100	60
MUL	54	61		59	50		91	85			
WHT	47	49	36	54	48	51	68	75		97	66
FRL	41	44	32	47	46	41	57	66		96	61
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	24	39	30	26	46	42	44	55		86	36
ELL	15	50	45	26	41		23			72	54
BLK	28	50	36	27	46	36	38	62		82	43
HSP	33	46	39	40	45	52	38	29		88	57
MUL	45	37		32	30		55	64		92	67
WHT	45	46	36	46	45	46	58	62		88	61

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
FRL	36	42	34	39	42	44	50	53		83	57
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	8	24	30	29	34	33	31	50		71	38
ELL	18	24		41	38						
BLK	34	40	33	38	41	40	45	46		86	42
HSP	29	34	11	44	42	29	50	54		94	43
MUL	20	15		42	33		40				
WHT	37	36	35	53	41	32	60	66		89	55
FRL	29	33	25	46	42	34	49	58		89	48

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	636
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	51
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	67
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	59
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	55
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 performance component was ELA lowest 25th percentile which was at 35% proficiency with a loss of 2% points from the previous year. This component has been consistently low. The largest contributing factor has been teacher turnover. Last year in particular, in both 9th and 10th grade, there were changes at the beginning of the year, and at midyear. This impeded the ability to adequately monitor these students and develop meaningful intervention plans (MTSS). The new teachers available for hire are not typically from colleges of education and, thus, lack knowledge of instructional pedagogy.

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

The component with the greatest decline was Math lowest 25th percentile which was at 42% with loss of 4%. In recent years, this component has been higher than District and State, but this year, it fell behind the State level by The factors that contributed to this decline were lack of a teacher in an Algebra 1 classroom for the first semester and the departure of another Algebra 1 teacher prior to the test. These areas had to be covered by long-term substitute teachers. Teachers available for hire are not typically from colleges of education, and thus, lack knowledge of instructional pedagogy.

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.

ELA Achievement has the greatest gap of a -11% point difference as compared to the state average. The teacher turnover and lack of knowledge of instructional pedagogy was the largest factor that contributed to our percentage, however, we made a 3% point gain from the previous year school score.

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

The greatest area of improvement was Social Studies achievement with a gain of 15% points. The Social Studies department conducted an intensive standards review and remediation sessions prior to the administration of the assessment.

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

The EWS area of concern is achievement on the state assessments (Level 1).

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

1. Lowest 25th percentile in ELA
2. Lowest 25th percentile in Math
3. ELA Achievement Overall
4. Algebra 1 Achievement Overall

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile has consistently been a low performing sub group, and this group showed a 2% decline in proficiency on the Spring 2019 FSA ELA Administration.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in the ELA lowest 25th Percentile group will show a 6 percentage point gain in proficiency on the Spring 2020 FSA ELA Administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Troy La Barbara (labarbara_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The "Students Achieving Success" program has been developed specifically designed to assist students in the lowest 25th percentile to improve performance on State Assessments. Teacher mentors are assigned to students to provide support and assistance with individual goal setting and monitoring, to make sure that students' basic needs are met by identifying specific needs, communicating with home and referring to resources as needed, and to improve their overall academic success. In addition, the VIP (Vespas Include Peers) program has been developed which pairs Juniors and Seniors who are demonstrating academic success and leadership with SWD (Students With Disabilities) who are in the lowest 25th percentile. The servant leaders (Juniors and Seniors) attend one class with their paired student each day. They assist their peers with organization, study skills, self-advocacy, and accommodations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to J. Hattie (December 2017) visiblelearning.com, self-reported grades and teacher estimates of achievement are high effect strategies on student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<p>Students Achieving Success</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A team of teachers met during the summer to identify research based strategies that are most effective in supporting low achieving students. 2. Through the research, the team determined that the most effective way to help students is to provide to identify students who are most in need. 2. A presentation was made to staff to recruit volunteers. 3. Mentors selected their specific students based upon prior knowledge, schedule availability, proximity, etc. 4. Mentor toolkit created by team will be distributed to the mentors to provide guidance on program expectations and accountability. 5. Students will be taught how to access their data, identify areas of need, set and monitor goals. 6. Mentors will meet with students on a regular schedule to discuss data and monitor progress on ELA standards. 7. Mentors will collect academic data (grades and progress monitoring performance) 8. Program data will be monitored monthly to evaluate and modify as needed. <p>Vespas Include Peers</p>

1. Met with the Florida Inclusion Network consultant over the summer to develop "Peers as Partners" Course which is a Florida State Approved Course.
2. Completed Course Adoption through Hernando County School District.
3. Met with guidance to get recommendations for students who may be interested in being Servant Leaders.
4. Held Parent/Student Information Meeting to recruit Student Servant Leaders (application process).
5. Administration, the staff coordinator, ESE team, and guidance determined students in the lowest 25th percentile who would best be served through VIP.
6. Coordinator developed schedules based upon recommendations made by the teams.
7. Program success is monitored monthly through grades, assignments completed in class, and progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	While ELA Achievement increased by 3 percentage points over the past year, to 45%, there is still a gap of 4 percentage points behind the District Average and 11 percentage points behind the State Average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	WWHS will gain 6 percentage points in ELA Achievement in order to start to close the gap between WWHS and the State Averages.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Troy La Barbara (labarbara_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will receive professional development on the Instructional Practices Guide. An Instructional Leadership Team, made up of teachers will visit classrooms using the IPG to observe teaching and provide meaningful feedback in order to train and develop a culture of strong instructional practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies in the IPG are considered the best instructional strategies to help students to achieve higher levels of success on the FSA ELA.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers who have demonstrated use of the instructional strategies will be identified and trained in use of the IPG. 2. Through PLCs, all teachers will be trained in effective instructional practices. 3. The Instructional Leadership Team will develop a schedule of visits to classrooms that include an observation followed by a meeting with the teacher observed to discuss the observation and analyze the instructional strategies used and their effectiveness. During this, emphasis is placed upon the observation of student behaviors. 4. Teachers who have been observed, will also have the opportunity to visit other classrooms to observe as part of the team. 5. This process will continue throughout the year focusing on new teachers to build their capacity for instructional practice.
Person Responsible	Troy La Barbara (labarbara_t@hcsb.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).

1. The AVID program is being implemented school wide to assist in all areas of achievement. The AVID program will provide teachers and students instructional and learning strategies that have been shown to increase achievement levels for students. The goal for the program is to encourage students who traditionally perform in the mid-range (high 2 to 3 and low 4) to strive for higher performance through taking Advanced Placement courses with added support.
2. The Advanced Placement Capstone Diploma option has been added so high achieving students are encouraged to take more challenging coursework, and to provide opportunities for mid-range students to

increase their level of achievement.

3.. The students who performed in the lowest 25th percentile in math will also be assisted through the Students Achieving Success Program , VIP program, the Instructional Leadership Team observations, and the Instructional Practices Guide training.

4. The overall ELA Achievement will also be addressed through Students Achieving Success and VIP (by raising the bottom 25th percentile, the overall achievement will improve). In addition, the AVID program is being implemented school wide.

5. Algebra I achievement will be supported by SAS (by increasing the success of bottom 25th percentile), VIP (by increasing the success of bottom 25th percentile SWDs), Instructional Leadership Team and Instruction Practices Guide (by working specifically with the math guide to assist new teachers with instructional methods), AVID (by improving students' learning strategies), and Advanced Placement Capstone Diploma Option (by creating a culture of rigor). Students will be encouraged and supported to achieve in all areas.

6. The faculty will continue using the Student Work Assessment Protocol weekly to identify and remedy areas of weakness in achievement of the standards in all subject areas. Departments will develop and administer common formative assessments

7. The Administrative team along with teachers will conduct monthly "blitz" classroom walk through visits using our "Cultural Look For" Pamphlet which outlines evidence of high impact instructional practices. This information will be used to identify trends in school-wide instructional practices.