

St. Lucie Public Schools

Treasure Coast 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Treasure Coast High School

1000 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/tch/>

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Lehman

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2019

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)	63%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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 St. Lucie 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Treasure Coast High School

1000 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/tch/>

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	55%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie 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 Treasure Coast High School is to ensure that all of our students are immersed in a safe, caring and academically challenging learning environment, an environment that is fun filled, educationally relevant and conducive to learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Treasure Coast is to continuously strive for excellence in both teaching and student learning through ongoing professional development that is focused on our students academic achievement and personal growth. Our aim is to strive for, achieve and maintain an "A" Grade.

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
Smith, Todd	Principal	Oversee school operations, school climate, and student achievement.
Roberts, Regina	Assistant Principal	
Oge, Alex	Assistant Principal	
Monroe, Jason	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/10/2019, Bradley Lehman

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

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)	63%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	724	757	735	739	2955	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	185	207	265	803	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	109	128	110	444	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	85	108	36	248	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	73	49	57	196	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	114	107	111	442	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	130	39	177	458	

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	560	540	544	541	2185

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	2	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	12	35	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/13/2020

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	687	735	687	698	2807	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	72	118	141	399	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	135	149	104	512	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	9	32	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	141	235	141	693	

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	84	79	134	85	382	

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	2	15

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	687	735	687	698	2807
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	72	118	141	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	135	149	104	512
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	9	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	141	235	141	693

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	84	79	134	85	382

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	2	15

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	53%	51%	56%	53%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	48%	51%	51%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	36%	42%	46%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	50%	40%	51%	54%	56%	49%
Math Learning Gains	52%	41%	48%	46%	44%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	38%	45%	41%	36%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	71%	68%	71%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	68%	73%	60%	66%	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	54%	54%	0%	55%	-1%
	2018	49%	52%	-3%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	73%	71%	2%	67%	6%
2018	69%	67%	2%	65%	4%
Compare		4%			
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%	68%	2%	70%	0%
2018	61%	63%	-2%	68%	-7%
Compare		9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	51%	-18%	61%	-28%
2018	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	55%	6%	57%	4%
2018	46%	50%	-4%	56%	-10%
Compare		15%			

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	12	30	31	29	40	38	52	45		96	18
ELL	27	56	65	34	59		48	43		90	54
ASN	72	61		53	64		90	79		100	64
BLK	48	49	42	42	50	51	66	62		98	57
HSP	52	50	51	51	49	51	69	71		98	67
MUL	43	40	60	54	48		86	79		100	76
WHT	57	54	37	57	57	61	80	77		98	67
FRL	46	47	44	46	52	54	67	65		98	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	20	38	39	13	35		40	34		96	21
ELL	19	35	35	22	39		40	22		88	52
ASN	86	68		64	60		100	77		100	80
BLK	43	49	43	34	41	25	59	55		96	50
HSP	53	49	40	45	44	43	69	62		97	57
MUL	52	55	50	55	61		83	57		100	50
WHT	57	53	40	51	45	40	77	67		98	56
FRL	48	50	44	40	41	34	67	56		97	52

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	30	33	25	30	29	28	23		78	29
ELL	14	44	43	40	57		50	38		96	59
ASN	54	63		65	64		81	50			
BLK	49	50	41	48	46	36	60	48		86	44
HSP	52	53	46	57	50	44	75	61		92	56
MUL	55	55	33	50	40	36	64	75		100	47
WHT	57	49	52	57	43	43	75	69		95	56
FRL	47	47	42	51	44	39	65	55		90	47

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	657
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
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	54
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	61
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	65
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	65
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	57
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.

Students with disabilities performed 8% lower in ELA proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25%. Teacher transition, attendance and COVID-19 played a role in this. This is not a trend with compared to the 2017 to current data.

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

Algebra I dropped 6% points with 33% percent proficiency. Factors that contributed to the decline may include teacher transition and student placement.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Overall Alg I Proficiency was 28% below the state average. Factors that may have contributed to the decline include teacher transition, teacher retention, and student placement based of previous data. This is not a trend when compared to 2017 witch was a 9% increase. However, 2018 was 23% below the state average.

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

Math Lowest 25% made the largest improvement with 17% gains for the 2018-2019 school year. Some of the strategies used are:

1. Strategic Scheduling
2. Remediation during electives
3. After school/Saturday boot camps
4. Teacher preference for testing
5. After school tutoring
6. Part time math instructional coach

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

students with disabilities is the subgroup with the lowest performance, not meeting the state minimum requirement of 41% in 2018.

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

1. Improve performance of Students with Disabilities
2. Improvement in ELA proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25%.
3. Increased performance in Algebra 1 and Geometry
4. Increase rigor in the online teaching
5. Equity and access with technology

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: School Climate and Culture including Early Warning Systems

Measurable Outcome:

1. The number of referrals will decrease by 20%
2. The number of students with attendance below 90% will be reduced by 25%
3. The number of students exhibiting 2 or more early warning indicators will decrease by 25%
4. Teacher perception of student behavior concerns as measured by the distinct teacher climate survey will decrease by 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Smith (todd.smith@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest/School Connect will be implemented to teacher students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walk through tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our student are lacking many of the basic life skills needed for success in school, at home and the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competences is a proven strategy used ot reduce discipline concerns, increase student buy-in, attendance and develop positive learning communities.

Action Steps to Implement

Include professional development and follow up coaching by the SEL department and school site team.

Person Responsible

Todd Smith (todd.smith@stlucieschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional planning and Universal Design for Learning. SWD are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in math.

Measurable Outcome: Student with disabilities are not achieving at the rate as the Alg 1. We will increase by 15% from the current status.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Todd Smith (todd.smith@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for learning across all instructional and non-instructional school context will be adopted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To provide a blueprint for planning for creating fluid instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits all solution but rather dynamic approaches that can be customized and adjusted to meet the needs of the individual.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained in UDL and FDLRS modifiers. Waring signs will be identified and traced using key data points using Panorama data. School-Wide SEL will be implemented and held daily with individual need assessments.

Person Responsible Todd Smith (todd.smith@stlucieschools.org)

No description entered

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.

- SEL instruction for all incoming students 30mins for 30 days
- Tiered interventions that limit missed class time
- Teachers on planning provide targeted instruction to students in Behavior Intervention Class
- Targeted instruction provided through PDs for classroom interventions and management strategies
- Implementation of mental health training for all teachers and students
- Use of Project Success counselor to meet with students as needed
- 10th grade World History teachers will help to monitor 10th grade unit assessment results and use Khan Academy as a resource for students.
- Ongoing Technology PD and distribution
- Constant safety modifications based on CDC guidelines
- CLPs, role-alike collaboration, and PLCs.
- Differentiated instruction describe a set of principles that call for recognition of a heterogeneous school environment, the equitable allocation of available resources to address the needs of diverse student populations, training of teachers through the provision of PD's that promote instructional practices targeting individual & collective student needs simultaneously, and an administrative team that embraces, cultivates & supports these principals.
- A number of instruments will be used to obtain information needed to assess both student and school need. These instruments include;
- Disaggregation and analysis of district, school and student assessment data
- Surveys (Student, Teacher, Parent/Community)
- Informal and formal discussions

Master scheduling will be based primarily on student prior year 2018 or earlier assessment scores, an individual student's most assured path to graduation, availability and certification of highly qualified teachers in applicable content areas and the maintaining of SLC teaming, particularly in lower school.

Allocated resources for classroom materials targeting lower quartile academic performers, high stakes test remediation and preparation, Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) and Advanced Placement (AP).

Data chats will be conducted to determine specific areas of need at the student and classroom level. The administrative team, along with department chairs, will continuously monitor assessment data and tailor class instruction and PD's based on what the data reveals.

Monthly team meetings and Department meetings offer opportunities for teacher teams and department to work collaboratively in the design, implementation and monitoring of best practices. Teachers in core subject areas will have a common planning time to allow role-alike groups to plan instructional strategies, and analyze student data.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) quarterly meetings will be facilitated by the administrative teams who will in-turn create sub-groups responsible for generating and disaggregating discipline and Academic performance data. The MTSS team will determine appropriate intervention strategies.

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.

The school utilizes various forms of communication to inform the community members of school events and announcements. Our school currently communicates messages through;

- TCHS endorsed Facebook page
- TCHS website
- School Messenger
- Marquee Board
- Remind texts to specific grade level groups.
- School Advisory Committee
- Parent Informational Night
- Project Success Counselor
- Counselors Corner
- Surveys (Student, Teacher, Parent/Community)
- Informal and formal discussions
- Student Government

Teachers and parents continue to communicate through the school/district Skyward system which provides real time information on student academic performance in each of their respective classes.

The Freshman SLC has an annual Freshman Open House which provides parents and students a broad introduction to high school, an opportunity to meet teachers first hand and tour the school campus. Titian ambassadors are identified leaders on campus who work with the incoming freshman. The 9th and 10th Grade SLC's have scheduled Student-Led parent conferences this year for students to professionally showcase their progress and/or mastery of pre-set standards. Students also reflect and self report recognized opportunities for improvement not limited to SEL. The Student-Led conferences encourage parents/guardian intervention so they may become more intimately involved in the students academic progress. This approach has proven successful in developing a more cohesive collaborative approach for all stakeholders.

Senior parent informational nights which address graduation requirements have been scheduled this year as well as a college-bound assemblies for the Junior class. College visits are planned when allowed.

As a Title 1 school we will also host parent informational events, such as Counselors' Corner, which correlate with student success. At risk students are identified and provided a mentor for further social and emotional needs.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00