

School District of Indian River County

Sebastian River High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Sebastian River High School

9001 90TH AVE, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Cummings

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 54% |
| 2019-20 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: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 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 Indian River 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Sebastian River High School

9001 90TH AVE, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 42% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 49% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | B | C |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River 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.

The mission of Sebastian River High School is “Encouraging Innovation and Promoting Excellence” with all students, so that each student achieves to his or her highest potential and becomes a contributing member of the global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Sebastian River High School is to ensure every student is college and career ready by creating a culture of excellence that is constantly focused on student achievement. We will create a climate of high expectation to ensure equitable access is achieved by ALL students in all areas. We will identify new areas of innovations and encourage a collaborative culture that is built by students, parents, staff, and community members collectively. We will meet the social and emotional needs of our students and their families, in order to provide a safe and healthy learning community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Cummings, Christopher | Principal | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinate and provide leadership in the Schools Improvement process, implementation of the School improvement plan and of the School Advisory Council. 2. Establish a vision, build teams to accomplish plans, goals and priorities of SRHS. 3. Promote and market SRHS and its priorities. |
| Contri, Jacque | Assistant Principal | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities. |
| Van Brimmer, Kevin | Assistant Principal | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities. |
| Truesdale, Branda | Teacher, ESE | <p>Department Chair</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |
| Daniel, Karyn | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Department Chair</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |
| Acosta, Heather | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Department Chair</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |
| Brown, Jody | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Department Chair</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Valencia, Enrique | School Counselor | 1. To Provide administrative support in the creation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. |
| Thimmer, James | Assistant Principal | 1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities. |
| Pinkney, Elizebeth | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach 1. To lead our teachers in instructional growth through proactive and collaborative coaching cycles to implement and master high-yield teaching strategies. ELA Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |
| Arce, Joshua | Teacher, K-12 | Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |
| Riskin, Robert | Assistant Principal | 1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities. |
| Walker, Fran | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach 1. To lead our teachers in instructional growth through proactive and collaborative coaching cycles to implement and master high-yield teaching strategies. 2. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan. |
| Hofer, Mike | Teacher, K-12 | |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| celesti, Sandra | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Christopher Cummings

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

2

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

106

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 54% |
| 2019-20 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: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%) |

| | |
|--|--|
| | 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 530 | 509 | 464 | 398 | 1901 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 91 | 90 | 64 | 353 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 41 | 30 | 10 | 130 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 118 | 75 | 35 | 359 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 80 | 93 | 65 | 333 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 113 | 123 | 62 | 460 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 74 | 22 | 37 | 259 | |

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 | 168 | 103 | 110 | 60 | 441 | |

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 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 21 | 31 | 13 | 76 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 | 480 | 457 | 380 | 1900 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 82 | 103 | 98 | 413 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 36 | 28 | 16 | 142 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 170 | 163 | 83 | 611 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 170 | 163 | 83 | 611 |

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 | 167 | 126 | 124 | 78 | 495 |

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 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 8 | 44 |

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 | 480 | 457 | 380 | 1900 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 82 | 103 | 98 | 413 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 36 | 28 | 16 | 142 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 170 | 163 | 83 | 611 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 170 | 163 | 83 | 611 |

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 | 167 | 126 | 124 | 78 | 495 |

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 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 8 | 44 |

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 | 46% | 58% | 56% | 44% | 55% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 49% | 54% | 51% | 44% | 49% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 40% | 42% | 30% | 34% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 48% | 51% | 47% | 44% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 40% | 46% | 48% | 42% | 38% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 29% | 39% | 45% | 33% | 31% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 68% | 68% | 53% | 64% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 47% | 68% | 73% | 59% | 74% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09 | 2019 | 44% | 55% | -11% | 55% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 52% | -8% | 53% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 53% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 51% | -6% | 53% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 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 | 58% | 64% | -6% | 67% | -9% |
| 2018 | 58% | 61% | -3% | 65% | -7% |
| 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 | 45% | 64% | -19% | 70% | -25% |
| 2018 | 56% | 70% | -14% | 68% | -12% |
| Compare | | -11% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 29% | 58% | -29% | 61% | -32% |
| 2018 | 40% | 61% | -21% | 62% | -22% |
| Compare | | -11% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 41% | 53% | -12% | 57% | -16% |
| 2018 | 55% | 50% | 5% | 56% | -1% |
| Compare | | -14% | | | |

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 | 18 | 34 | 27 | 14 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 38 | | 88 | 16 |
| ELL | 14 | 23 | 19 | 13 | 29 | 23 | 22 | 6 | | 82 | |
| ASN | 69 | 50 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 46 | 26 | 26 | 39 | 46 | 53 | 33 | | 80 | 36 |
| HSP | 38 | 44 | 27 | 30 | 39 | 24 | 55 | 42 | | 87 | 63 |
| MUL | 36 | 52 | | 29 | 38 | | 40 | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 53 | 46 | 43 | 41 | 27 | 64 | 54 | | 96 | 64 |
| FRL | 36 | 42 | 26 | 31 | 38 | 30 | 51 | 45 | | 89 | 56 |
| 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 | 15 | 37 | 37 | 29 | 35 | 25 | 37 | 21 | | 70 | 35 |
| ELL | 8 | 47 | 43 | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | 50 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 48 | 42 | 28 | 32 | 29 | 38 | 44 | | 70 | 43 |
| HSP | 39 | 47 | 34 | 41 | 48 | 34 | 51 | 51 | | 85 | 67 |
| MUL | 30 | 30 | | 58 | | | 50 | | | 61 | 73 |
| WHT | 53 | 53 | 42 | 56 | 61 | 45 | 66 | 63 | | 87 | 74 |
| FRL | 38 | 47 | 41 | 42 | 54 | 36 | 51 | 52 | | 80 | 66 |
| 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 | 26 | 24 | 18 | 35 | 43 | 20 | 31 | | 73 | 56 |
| ELL | 17 | 19 | 8 | | | | | | | 50 | |
| BLK | 31 | 31 | 20 | 29 | 30 | 24 | 29 | 46 | | 84 | 55 |
| HSP | 32 | 39 | 27 | 41 | 41 | 35 | 46 | 45 | | 84 | 61 |
| MUL | 25 | 47 | | 18 | | | | | | 82 | |
| WHT | 55 | 49 | 35 | 54 | 44 | 33 | 63 | 69 | | 86 | 65 |
| FRL | 35 | 38 | 30 | 43 | 42 | 36 | 45 | 54 | | 83 | 52 |

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 | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 54 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 545 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 29 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 60 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 46 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 39 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 54 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Lowest quartile gains in Math (29%) and ELA (33%). In math, teachers identified a misalignment of the curriculum map and standards. Additionally, in 2018-19 some Algebra teachers were teaching a single-year Algebra I course and others were teaching Algebra 1-B, collaboration and team planning was not seen as feasible. The results indicate a lack of instructional quality across our classrooms. In 2019-20, course corrections and improved pacing were implemented. In ELA, collaborative planning was not common place, so instructional integrity and quality was not the same across all classrooms.

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

Mathematics gains declined the most from our prior year. In 2017-2018, 53% and 40% in 2018-19. Teachers identified mis-alignment of curriculum maps and standards, collaboration and team planning was not feasible and lack of instructional quality.

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 US History Exam showed the greatest decline from the prior year. SRHS ranked at 56% in comparison to the state average which was 71%. The contributing factors to this decline was based on the lack of collaborative planning for all US History teachers. Data analysis of test item specs did

not improve scores based on student performance in weaker areas related to the standards. Instructional reading strategies/trainings were not acquired in a timely manner to make a difference in low level readers, who struggled with comprehension and acquisition of knowledge as it pertains to the course content, which was evident in student's test scores.

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

Sebastian River High School's graduation rate increased from 84% to 91%. The new action taken to improve our graduation rate was our ability to enroll students in our credit retrieval program during the school day. Additionally, Sebastian River High School also offered credit retrieval during summer school to all seniors who were lacking required credits. Sebastian River High School's Graduation coach was also a primary reason why our graduation rate significantly increased last year. The Graduation Coach was able to meet with those seniors and juniors who were at risk of not meeting the graduation requirements and was able to monitor each student's progress and advise them on a continuous basis.

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

According to Early Warning System the potential areas of concern are as follows: 2019 and 2020 FSA Reading and Math Level 1 students.

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

1. Using a Data Driven Instructional System (DDIS) in order to provide targeted instruction, tracking/ progress monitoring, motivation for our students and teachers.
2. Incorporation of Daily Learning Targets in order to unpack, understand, and provide rigorous and engaging instruction for our students.
3. Performance of our lowest 25% students in Math and ELA Indian River - 0291 - Sebastian River High School - 2019-20 SIP
4. Continue full implementation of Achieve 3000 for 9th and 10th grade reading students
5. Additional help and support for ELL, ESE, and Multi-cultural students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Daily learning targets focused on a scaffolded approach to rigorous standard- based instruction. Marzano and Hattie show that learning goals/targets are a high-effect size strategy. Sebastian River High School has had a double-digit decline in all three areas of math scores (Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest Quartile gains) from 18-19 to 19-20 school year. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Sebastian River High School will increase our average Unit Assessment scores in all tested subjects by 5% as compared to the previous school year. In addition, on state assessments SRHS will increase by a minimum of 5 points for Math and ELA in Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest quartile scores on 2020-2021 state testing. Through classroom walkthroughs and the data collected from them, we will increase from 50% of teachers having daily learning targets posted to 100% of core tested teachers utilizing Daily learning targets to scaffold the standard for all student. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Jacque Contri (jacqueline.contri@indianriverschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Students use “I Can” statements (e.g., “I can solve quadratic equations”) to address the topic for each day’s lesson. These daily learning targets will be utilized to chunk instruction into digestible bites. Each student will enter the classroom understanding what they should know when leaving while teachers will progress monitor for successful content delivery. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Robert Marzano lists learning goals as one of his most impactful and high yield areas of student achievement and John Hattie shows the average effect size of 0.68. This area will allow our teachers to unpack the standards, scaffold instruction, and monitor students to provide individualized daily instruction(study can be found at https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/math/every-classroom-every-day-eced-math). One large, two-year study evaluated outcomes of this program. (Participating schools were located in Arizona, California, New York, and Tennessee. Compared to control schools, participating schools made greater gains on state math tests (effect size =+0.14). This qualified ECED for the ESSA “Strong” category. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. During pre-plan week the utilization of daily learning targets, i.e. – I Can... statements, and their connection of student achievement, specifically among ESSA subgroups, was introduced.

Person Responsible Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

2. Coaches and Leadership Team members provided professional development in how to develop the daily targets through standard deconstruction.
3. Teachers will meet twice monthly on Mondays from 2:05-3p.m. in their collaborative planning group.
4. During collaborative planning session: Teachers will identify the daily learning targets and plan for implementation within the classroom period utilizing curriculum map and standard alignment.

Person Responsible Mike Hofer (mike.hofer@indianriverschools.org)

5. Teachers will create and use short formative assessments to progress-monitor student achievement toward the daily learning target(s).

Person Responsible Sandra celesti (sandra.celesti@indianriverschools.org)

6. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and observations to monitor fidelity. They will provide non-evaluative feedback through a common tool to record if learning targets are present and if they are aligned with the learning happening in the classroom that day.

Person Responsible Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to Data Driven Instructional Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Continuous monitoring of student data by student/teacher through formative and summative assessments to increase student achievement through collaborative planning. Monitoring student regression using timely data helps to close the achievement gap among all subgroups. SRHS currently has three ESSA subgroups performing at below 41% achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Sebastian River High School will increase our average Unit Assessment scores in all tested subjects by 5% as compared to the previous school year. In addition, on state assessments SRHS will increase by a minimum of 5 points for Math and ELA in Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest quartile scores on 2020-2021 state testing. Through classroom walkthroughs and the data collected from them, we will increase from 14% of teachers data monitoring to 100% of core tested teachers utilize the formative assessments at least twice weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data-driven Instructional Systems (DDIS) model will be used as the structures and practices school leaders use to develop their schools' capacity to use data for instruction. Building on this research in distributed leadership and organizational learning theory, the DDIS framework describes how we will create systems to re-culture SRHS for accountability. A successful DDIS will help to translate summative achievement test data into formative data teachers and students can use to improve teaching and learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In 14 different studies, teachers had students in one class track their progress on assessments; in a second class, these teachers taught the same content for the same length of time without having students track their progress (see www.marzanoresearch.com/research/strategy20_trackingprogress.aspx). On average, the practice of having students track their own progress was associated with a 32 percentile point gain in their achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Training on formative assessment writing and data tracking, both for teachers and students, will be provided to teachers through department meetings via department leaders

Person Responsible Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Through collaborative planning, all teachers will create formative assessments that will be administered for immediate data collection each week. The data from these assessments will be shared in a document called the "Dorsal Report" that will be updated weekly. Teachers will track the percentage of students below, meeting, and exceeding expectations on mastery of targeted skills covered and discuss at bi-weekly department meetings data chats.

Person Responsible Fran Walker (frances.walker@indianriverschools.org)

Teachers will share and analyze their data and discuss areas of concern and how to remediate. Students will conference with teachers about their personal data tracking form. These forms will track performance on summative assessments as well, which differ based on the course (District Unit Assessments, chapter tests, unit tests, etc), and include areas for student reflection and action plan for improvement.

Person Responsible Elizebeth Pinkney (elizabeth.pinkney@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Sebastian River High School will eliminate the opportunity gap that exists for lower performing students by providing high expectations as well as rigorous grade-level appropriate instruction for all. The implementation of equitable practices will remove academic barriers and encourage a growth mindset in all school spaces. Through training we will broaden all staff members understanding of rigorous academic delivery, instructional strategies and the setting of high expectations that specifically target underrepresented students that will promote a diverse collaborative culture and increase student self-efficacy.

Measurable Outcome:

Sebastian River High School will conduct an initial walk thru using a Non-Evaluative Feedback (NEF) form to create a baseline on teacher instruction in the classroom during the first quarter of instruction. Our look fors will consist of task aligned to rigor of standard, student engagement, and observable equitable practices. We will use trend data to pair teachers with instructional coaches in order to improve instructional practices. Trend data will be shared with faculty and used to drive our professional development. We will also increase our baseline data by 2% each month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

According to Hattie, Teacher Clarity of High Expectations is one of the most potent influences on student achievement. Robert Marzano agrees, including lesson goals in his top 5 list of factors that affect how well students do at school. John Hattie highlights how important it is for our students to be clear about what we want them to learn in each lesson.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Hattie states that High Expectation for lesson goals: Clearly state what you want your students to learn, can focus on surface and deep learning, must be challenging for the students relative to their current mastery of the topic, may be grouped (i.e. a single lesson may have more than one goal), and must be shared with the STUDENTS. A study by the The New Teacher Project (tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_The-Opportunity-Myth_Web.pdf) found that there was a 9% difference in success on grade-level work between classrooms consisting mainly of students of color vs. white students. The same study found that 38% of the majority-minority classrooms never had a single grade-level assignment vs. just 12% of the white majority classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Admin met with leadership team during pre-planning week to discuss Universal Design for Learning strategies in an effort to remove instructional barriers and create an environment where all students have access to rigorous grade level instruction.
2. Instructional Coach will work with ELA and Math Departments to help facilitate the creation of daily classrooms tasks that meet the rigor of the covered standards weekly.
3. Admin will conduct baseline walk through during the last week of September to calibrate our observational look-fors and to determine the current level of equitable instruction in classroom.
4. Admin will continue to conduct monthly walkthroughs to monitor for equitable instruction by viewing how students react to teachers directives using the NEFF.
5. Admin will present data from monthly walkthroughs to faculty and create an action plan for improvement for the following month which will include updating of SIP or Professional Development plans.

Person Responsible

Jacque Contri (jacqueline.contri@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Theme**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Sebastian River High School (SRHS) wants to increase the representation of all students, specifically minority students, in advanced curriculum/industry certification courses (IB, AP, Dual Enrollment, CTE). When students are exposed to higher level courses, they are more prepared for post-secondary opportunities as well as the potential to reach their highest academic ceiling, including graduation. Current data shows that only 14% of our African Americans and 17% of Hispanics are currently enrolled in an advanced curriculum course. Combined, 33% of students currently enrolled in an advanced curriculum course are minority. Currently, 21% (404 out of 1949) of SRHS's overall student population are enrolled in an advanced curriculum course and 56% (1084 out of 1949) are enrolled in an industry certification course. Current data shows that 27% of our African Americans and 44% of Hispanics are currently enrolled in CTE/Industry Certification courses. In total, 76% (1488 out of 1949) of the total student population is enrolled in advanced curriculum/industry certification courses (IB, AP, Dual Enrollment, CTE).

Measurable Outcome:

By identifying students through teacher recommendations, guidance consultations, and Administration data reviews, SRHS can increase the number of students, specifically minority students, taking an advanced course by 3% (45 students) and 3% (45 students) taking an industry certification, before the start of next school year. This goal will over arch several years until we have 100% of seniors graduate with at least one AP, IB, Dual Enrollment, or Industry certification credit.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

As described in the Classroom Instruction That Works, Creating the Environment for Learning (strategy) are the backdrop for every lesson. When teachers create an environment for learning, they motivate and focus student learning by helping students know what is expected of them, providing students with opportunities for regular feedback on their progress, and assuring students that they are capable of learning challenging content and skills. By starting with relationships it promotes student engagement during the lesson, which creates learning opportunities for students to share and discuss their ideas, and develop collaboration skills, and learn how to monitor and reflect on their own learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Participation in AP/IB classes is associated with many benefits. Students who participate in accelerated courses are more likely to receive higher scores on the American College Test (ACT; Warne, Larsen, Anderson & Odasso, 2015) and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT; McKillip & Rawls, 2013), and are more likely to attend college (Chajewski, Mattern, & Shaw, 2011). Students who have completed accelerated courses in high school often experience higher college GPAs (Murphy & Dodd, 2009) and save money based on course credits earned for their AP/IB exam performance (Dougherty, Mellor, & Jian, 2006). For Hispanic and African American students or students from low-SES backgrounds, enrollment in AP classes, particularly before 11th grade, also relates to higher high school graduation rates (Long, Conger, & Iatarola, 2012).
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED602891.pdf>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use teacher recommendations from previous year to identify students who would benefit from taking accelerated coursework.
2. Guidance counselors, Graduation Coach, IB Coordinator, and Admin will work together during monthly leadership meetings to determine what how to adjust our Master Schedule to increase the number of advance courses quarterly.
3. School Leadership team members will also help identify students as well as counsel students on how to be successful in accelerated courses.
4. Through the use of PeerForward and a school based Mentorship program for our AA and Hispanic students SRHS will put support structures in place for students including after school tutoring, Saturday tutoring, and daily interventions to ensure student achievement.
4. Guidance counselors, Student Success Coach, and Graduation Coach will help monitor student progress and meet with struggling students as needed.
5. Admin will use class observations and walk-throughs to monitor student progress in the classroom as well as routine data checks to create a cycle of support for students.

Person Responsible Fran Walker (frances.walker@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Sebastian River High School will also address the social and emotional needs of our students and staff members by providing SEL training for all staff members quarterly. These trainings will be focused on Emotional Self-Care for staff and Trauma Informed Care targeted towards both staff and students emotional states. The training will be provided by the school district department of Student Support Services. The initial training for this focus area was conducted during the pre-planning week when teachers arrived back on campus for the 2020-2021 school year and will continue through the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarter.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Sebastian River High School has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|---|--|----------------|-----|-------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$184.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0291 - Sebastian River High School | General Fund | | \$184.00 |
| | | | Notes: Non-Evaluative Feedback Forms for Coaching and Instructional practices improvements. | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Data Driven Instructional Systems | | | | \$20,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5000 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0291 - Sebastian River High School | | | \$20,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: From data collected monthly, SRHS will determine which students will need additional after school tutoring provided for remedial instruction. | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | | | | \$21,500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 399000-OTHER MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES | 0291 - Sebastian River High School | General Fund | | \$13,500.00 |
| | | | Notes: PO for African American Achievement Plan materials | | | |
| | | 3000-TAXES | 0291 - Sebastian River High School | | | \$8,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Students will be provided transportation for after school tutoring twice per week. | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Theme | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | \$41,684.00 |