Terry Parker High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Terry Parker High School

7301 PARKER SCHOOL RD, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/tphs

Demographics

Principal: Robert Hudson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval 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

Terry Parker High School

7301 PARKER SCHOOL RD, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/tphs

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Terry Parker High School aims to provide meaningful daily instruction and multiple pathways to ensure all students, regardless of program, are given the tools necessary to succeed in life. Terry Parker High School provides opportunities for students to apply knowledge in real-world experiences, to gain knowledge in developing interpersonal skills, and to bridge the gap between high school and global citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will be competent consumers of information as they seek out and create opportunities to expand their awareness and knowledge of the world. They will empower their own educational path and be leaders in programs on our campus with the aim of making our school, as well as, the world a better place.

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
Daniels, Evan	Principal	
Trotter, Kellie	Teacher, ESE	
Seabrooks, Alesha	Assistant Principal	
Harris, Oscar	Assistant Principal	
Curran, Pat	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Paul	Assistant Principal	
Holmes, Loietta	Assistant Principal	
Torrance, Melinda	Teacher, K-12	
Ward, Adam	Teacher, K-12	
Edgerton, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Badger, Ricky	Teacher, ESE	
Johnson-Hart, Stephanie	Dean	
Smith, Leonard	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/22/2020, Robert Hudson

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
93

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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.	

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

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	431	491	376	325	1623
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	49	37	32	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	27	18	20	100
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	18	12	4	64
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	55	40	28	190

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	27	18	13	21	79

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	18	32	23	1	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	12

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	431	491	376	325	1623
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	49	37	32	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	27	18	20	100
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	18	12	4	64
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	55	40	28	190

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	27	18	13	21	79

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	18	32	23	1	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	12

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	47%	56%	36%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	48%	51%	49%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	42%	42%	39%	39%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	40%	51%	51%	54%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	52%	48%	51%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	45%	40%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	46%	65%	68%	55%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	70%	73%	63%	64%	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	27%	48%	-21%	55%	-28%
	2018	25%	48%	-23%	53%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	31%	48%	-17%	53%	-22%
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

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	44%	67%	-23%	67%	-23%
2018	50%	63%	-13%	65%	-15%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-6%			

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	61%	68%	-7%	70%	-9%
2018	61%	64%	-3%	68%	-7%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	57%	-36%	61%	-40%
2018	24%	61%	-37%	62%	-38%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	61%	-12%	57%	-8%
2018	32%	57%	-25%	56%	-24%
Compare		17%			

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	7	30	34	14	30		24	46		89	31
ELL	9	26	16	26	43		18	23		76	38
ASN	30	42		62						100	93
BLK	24	40	40	34	42	34	42	58		94	54
HSP	29	36	17	34	53	64	42	60		96	50
MUL	42	50		79			40	85		100	63
WHT	50	58	50	57	55	60	67	84		88	73
FRL	26	39	32	34	41	43	42	55		93	55

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	12	20	9	7			21	33		78	45
ELL	4	30	26	13			31	39		86	67
ASN	39	56	30	53				75		93	69
BLK	27	38	27	27	50	54	44	61		88	60
HSP	35	44	30	35	54		59	61		86	74
MUL	62	65		47			82	69		90	78
WHT	50	50	17	44	58		69	78		95	83
FRL	32	43	30	31	51	50	50	62		90	63

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	11	22	19	20	47		21	40		90	43
ELL	8	34	35	63	63		40	46		61	82
ASN	56	65									
BLK	29	45	43	54	52	46	48	59		86	71
HSP	34	53	34	63	59	50	58	71		83	70
MUL	46	60		33	27		67	48		75	
WHT	51	53	22	55	51	29	65	71		91	86
FRL	32	48	39	53	52	43	46	59		87	69

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	62
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	47
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	48
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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	46
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.

The ELA Lowest 25 Percentile showed the lowest performance. The contributing factor to last year's performance was the students were placed in an English Honors course since we do not offer standard classes. As a result, the students experienced instruction that was at a faster pace than normal.

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

The ELA Lowest 25 Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Unfortunately, the reading teacher did not follow the curriculum guide given by the district and did not provide differentiated instruction on a daily basis.

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 compared to the state average was the ELA Lowest 25 Percentile and Math Proficiency. In both subjects, we were one percentage below the state average. The factor that contributed the most is that we did not offer consistent tutoring for these students outside of the classroom.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Geometry Achievement. As a result of monthly monitoring, students improved their Geometry ability.

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

One potential concern is that we have several students that are failing English and Math courses due to the academic rigor.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Algebra 1 Proficiency
3. LPQ in ELA
4. LPQ in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The identified area of focus is standards-based aligned planning, tasks and assessments. During the 19-20 school year, less than 50% of our teachers demonstrated strengths in standards based instructional planning aligned to tasks and assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Based upon the instructional review rubric, the vast majority of content area teachers will be able to create and deliver standard aligned instruction and assessments as measured by the Standards Based Walk-Through Tool.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the learning arc framework, teachers and administrators will engage in high quality common planning and Professional Learning Communities, yielding students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery on grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Opportunity Myth, it is our resposibility to ensure students are exposed to standards-aligned instruction and to ensure they're preparedness for assessments designed by the state in addition to the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Train leadership team, teachers, paraprofessionals and tutors on the relationship between the SIP and the standards based initative requirement in addition to Florida Standards and Item Specifications.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Faciliate professional development with leadership team on the Standards Based Instructional Review process.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Professional development sessions will focus on unpacking standards and deepening knowledge of the pedagogy needed to deliver effective standards aligned instruction. These sessions will include student work analysis protocol and how to effectively give feedback.

Person Responsible	Loietta Holmes (holmesl@duvalschools.org)

Utilize district supported and approved reading curriculum to address gaps in learning during Tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible	Loietta Holmes (holmesl@duvalschools.org)

Utilize Title One funds to hire additional classroom teachers, deans, support staff, and technology to support the execution of the area of focus.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Administrators and identified lead teaches will facilitate professional development sessions weekly.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Identify and equip lead teachers via the gradual release model to develop agendas for common planning and faciliate weekly common planning sessions. Ultimately resulting in sole ownership of teachers.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs to track and monitor progress.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data from the 5 Essentials Survey there will be an increase in the area of School Safety by 5 points. The 5 Essentials Survey data indicated that the area of School Safety was VERY WEAK, as evidenced by a decrease between the 1819 and 1920 school years.
Measurable Outcome:	The 5 point increase in the area of School Safety will lead to an increase in positive culture and climate for all stake holders.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Oscar Harris (harriso@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will implement a PBIS plan with fidelity to support the safety area of focus in conjunction with support from DCPS Office of Climate and Culture. The additional school dean purchased with Title 1 funds will be utilized to support the area of School Safety.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS plan will lead to an increase in School Safety in addition to positive social and emotional relationships among students, staff, parents and other stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Facilitate quarterly cultural competency training sessions for staff and checkpoints throughout the year.
2. Administrators and Guidance Counselor will track and monitor IEP goals in FOCUS and with teachers.
3. Utilize Blackboard to strengthen home-school communication with parents and guardians schoolwide.
4. Continue to implement AVID and PBIS strategies to increase the desired behaviors.
5. Implement monthly leadership socials with specific targets and goals like NO referrals and 95% attendance.
6. Utilize Guidance Counselor to facilitate whole group and small group sessions to address behavior and attendance.
7. Administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs with Deans to track and monitor progress.
8. ESOL paraprofessionals will be utilized to communicate with non-English speaking students and parents.

Person Responsible	Oscar Harris (harriso@duvalschools.org)

#3. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Graduation Rate is the identified area of focus. Within the 1819 school grade calculation, Parker earned a 93% graduation rate. The school consistently increases graduation rate each year by 3 percentage points. A significant indicator of the overall success of the school, negative codes and proper student scheduling will remain a priority for school administration throughout the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the DCPS provided At-Risk Grad Tracker, the school administration and 12th grade school counselor will be able to identify negative codes and strategically target location and/or conference with students regarding potential options that will support their earning a high school diploma.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Loietta Holmes (holmesl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the DCPS provided At-Risk Grad Tracker, school-based administration and school counselors will engage in in-depth trainings and Professional Learning Communities with other DCPS schools and GRIT Team, resulting in an increased student graduation rate .
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is our professional responsibility that students are prepared for post-secondary college and/or career opportunities upon graduation. These actions will ensure an increased number of students will be positively impacted by successfully receiving a high school diploma.

Action Steps to Implement

Participation in bi-weekly collaboration with GRIT Team point of contact to discuss negative codes and at-risk students.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Weekly admin/school counseling meetings to discuss student progress and tracking.

Person Responsible	Evan Daniels (danielse1@duvalschools.org)

Administration and school counselors will meet quarterly with at-risk students and parents to discuss student progress, graduation readiness, etc.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will utilize the 5 Essentials in addition to school based survey data to track and monitor the areas of focus.The team will make adjustments as necessary that will lead to meeting or exceeding targets.

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.

All stakeholders are invited to all events and activities at H. Terry Parker Senior High School. The events are on the school's social media outlets and the monthly school calendar which is distributed to all stakeholders. The school host events and information is translated in different languages since we have a high ESOL population. Parents of ESE students are also encouraged to attend events and give input. The school promotes district and community events as well to ensure all stakeholders remain abreast on what is available in the district and school community. The school utilizes weekly phone calls to communicate daily/ weekly with parents and/or guardians. During school events, stakeholders are encouraged to give feedback and input as to what would enhance the experience.

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	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Graduation Rate	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00