Titusville High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Titusville High School

150 TERRIER TRL S, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.titusville.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Gonzalez L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	55%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 Brevard 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

Titusville High School

150 TERRIER TRL S, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.titusville.brevard.k12.fl.us

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 PK, 9-12	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

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 Brevard 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.

Titusville High School fosters the academic passion ("I Want It"), purpose ("I Know Why I Want It"), and perseverance ("I Will Work to Get It!") that students need to be successful in the college or career of their choosing. (revised 2019)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Titusville High School will foster a high performing learning culture in which students, staff, and community members promote academic excellence, creativity, empathy, equity, and the pursuit of excellence. (revised 2019)

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
Gonzalez, Jennifer	Principal	Serve as an instructional leader in the school by providing feedback on practices and professional development on research-based strategies. Engage stakeholders through surveys, community events, and the SAC. Collaborate in the school's decision making process through school and community committees.
Burgess, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Serve as an instructional leader by providing relevant, research-based instructional strategies to teachers. Engage stakeholders through school events such as open house, the Terrier Experience, the school website, and social media forums. Collaborate in the school's decision making process through leadership team meetings.
Marovich, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Serve as an instructional leader by working with various teachers on classroom teaching strategies-- specifically reading strategies. Engage stakeholders through professional development opportunities and parent/community resources to assist students. Collaborate in the school's decision making process through leadership team meetings.
Rassman, Todd	Assistant Principal	Serve as an instructional leader by providing feedback to teachers on instructional practices. Engage stakeholders through parent conferences. Collaborate in the school's decision making process through leadership team meetings.
Hultgren, Holly	Dean	Serve as an instructional leader by providing feedback to teachers on instructional practices and assisting with professional development opportunities. Engage stakeholders by developing relationships with business partners. Collaborate in the school's decision making process through leadership team meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/9/2019, Jennifer Gonzalez L

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.*
0

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
74

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	55%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	327	337	270	301	1235
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	93	58	46	326
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	36	27	16	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	69	43	21	187
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	40	21	16	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	34	31	164
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	44	16	159
4th Quarter Learning Loss	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	61	90	61	47	259

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	23	55	44	12	134
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	2	6	24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/30/2020

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	335	338	339	295	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	25	27	30	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	41	33	25	145
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	39	18	156
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	76	34	16	192

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	19	22	20	7	68

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	7	5	10	11	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	11	30

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	335	338	339	295	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	25	27	30	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	41	33	25	145
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	39	18	156
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	76	34	16	192

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	19	22	20	7	68

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	7	5	10	11	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	11	30

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	58%	59%	56%	58%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	52%	51%	49%	51%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	40%	42%	40%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	43%	48%	51%	52%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	49%	48%	46%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	45%	33%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	62%	66%	68%	74%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	70%	73%	72%	67%	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	56%	62%	-6%	55%	1%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	1%					

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	66%	66%	0%	67%	-1%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	76%	67%	9%	65%	11%
Compare		-10%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	85%	71%	14%	70%	15%
2018	78%	70%	8%	68%	10%
Compare		7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	31%	61%	-30%	61%	-30%
2018	31%	62%	-31%	62%	-31%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	46%	60%	-14%	57%	-11%
2018	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
Compare		-6%			

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	23	33	30	15	33	25	27	36		70	29
ELL	7	13	8	27	33		20				
ASN	72	46		82	50		82	82			
BLK	40	39	34	23	40	35	32	63		85	53
HSP	43	34	9	39	51	40	58	78		82	74
MUL	52	38	10	39	45		72	82		78	71
WHT	65	53	42	50	51	49	71	88		88	81
FRL	44	40	33	34	43	39	48	73		81	66

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	22	32	25	16	36	26	61	52		60	60
ASN	74	59		75	64		100	73			
BLK	37	42	41	26	36	27	52	63		73	60
HSP	55	45	28	35	34	21	79	80		75	83
MUL	58	36		39	39		79	76		81	86
WHT	65	50	47	55	52	49	85	84		87	79
FRL	47	42	42	39	44	37	71	72		72	61

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	4	35	37	13	23	25	38	28		74	29
ASN	72	70		71	72		65			100	91
BLK	30	37	35	22	27	23	42	50		81	43
HSP	49	45	42	41	39	32	66	61		90	63
MUL	56	48	43	50	49	46	83	64		100	74
WHT	68	53	42	63	52	39	84	82		90	71
FRL	45	43	37	45	43	33	69	65		86	55

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	56
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	620
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	21
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	69
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	44
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	51
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	54
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	50
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.

1. ALG EOC - high teacher turnover in one of two algebra classrooms; inconsistent standards-based instruction
2. SWD - high ESE suspension rate
3. ELL - lack of targeted instruction and differentiation

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

1. SWD Science and Social Studies (-34 points, -16 points) - high suspension rate; lack of consistent push-in supports

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.

ALG EOC (-30 points) -Trend of low Algebra scores; inconsistent instructional practices

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

Graduation Rate:
1. Black Grad Rate (+12%)
2. SWD Grad Rate (+10%)
3. FRL Grad Rate (+9%)
Monitor the Deficiency Report; monitor testing opportunities; focus on scheduling equitably; mentoring; math remediation plan

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

1. 9th and 10th graders have the highest absentee rate, suspension rate, and course failure rate. It is in these grades that students take Alg 1A/B, Alg 1, and Geometry.
2. Attendance declined overall last year.

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

1. Increase Math Achievement rates.
2. Improve SWD and ELL subgroup progress in all areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Algebra 1 EOC and Geometry EOC scores. THS Math EOC scores have shown little improvement over the past two testing cycles. The school experienced significant turnover for Algebra and Geometry teachers over the past three years which likely negatively impacted students' progress. We further believe that these low scores illustrate that standards-based instructional strategies must improve. Algebra teachers must continue to implement strategies to enhance standards-based instruction and continue participating in professional development opportunities to enhance their skills.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021 school year: 1. The Algebra EOC pass rate will increase from 31% to 40%. 2. The Geometry pass rate will increase from 46% to 53%. 3. The SWD Math Achievement rate will increase from 15% to 25%. 4. 40% of SWD will demonstrate an Annual Learning Gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher collaboration; professional development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers must continue to acquire the necessary skills needed to provide successful standards-based instruction which correctly aligns to outcome measures. Teacher collaboration, professional development, and CMA groups will help build collective teacher efficacy, enhance instruction, and benefit all math students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The district resource math teacher will provide observation and feedback to math teachers regarding instructional practices and curriculum planning around priority testing standards.

Person Responsible	Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs and provide informal feedback regarding instructional strategies and communication.

Person Responsible	Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

3. CMA teacher groups will meet monthly to collaborate and work on math content-specific strategies which engage students and create formative and common assessments. Admin will attend meetings.

Person Responsible	Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

4. Math teachers will meet quarterly to analyze individual student data from MAP NWEA progress monitoring to ensure students are meeting testing standards and to self-assess progress towards instructional standards.

Person Responsible	Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

5. Math teachers will participate in professional development opportunities for high-yield instructional practices. Administration will provide opportunities for teachers with two or less years of experience to observe peers who are highly effective mathematics instructors.

Person Responsible Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

6. Setup a Google Classroom for ALL Algebra and Geometry students to access test prep, helpful links, and other math resources for students to access at school or home.

Person Responsible Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

7. Use Cares Act funds to implement an Algebra Bootcamp to assist students with preparation for the EOC.

Person Responsible Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

8. Utilize WIN Time for math remediation including PERT/Alg EOC prep for 2021 Cohort students and PSAT prep for other cohorts.

Person Responsible Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase SWDs and ELLs ELA Achievement, Annual Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% for SWD's on the FSA ELA EOC. Data analysis of 2018/2019 SWDs and ELLs FSA ELA scores indicate that over the past three years, these groups have made very limited progress towards achieving grade level mastery of ELA standards. Within the SWDs subgroup, there has only been an increase of 1% in ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%. Also of note, in 2019 SWDs performed very poorly in social studies and science EOCs, which require grade level reading proficiency. 2019 was the first year of available data for ELLs in ELA, and although these students comprised a small percentage of THS' total student population, since then the number of ELL enrollments has tripled, and based upon county trend that number is expected to continue to increase. ELL students performed very poorly in in all three target areas with the highest success in overall ELA LG. That number was only 13%.
Measurable Outcome:	40% of SWD and ELL's will demonstrate an ELA Achievement, Annual Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% on the ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide additional support to SWDs and ELLs by raising awareness of these students, their needs, and providing tiered supports and interventions to support their continued acquisition of ELA skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers must continue to acquire the necessary skills needed to provide successful, standards-based instruction. Teacher collaboration with the literacy coach, ESE teachers, and ESOL support staff will build collective teacher efficacy, enhance instruction, and benefit students within the targeted subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ESE certified teachers and ESE/ESOL instructional assistants will push-in into English and other content classes to provide targeted, one-to-one and small group assistance to SWDs and ELLs.

Person Responsible	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)

2. Teachers in all subject areas will identify their students who are in the Lowest 25th Percentile. With the assistance of the literacy coach, teachers will use this information to design and implement high-yield strategies which will assist these students in reading and comprehending content. These strategies might include: setting high expectations, front-loading vocabulary, scaffolding, differentiation by content, process, or product, concept-mapping, etc. Administrators will provide feedback to teachers based upon observations during walk-throughs and informal observations regarding curriculum planning and instructional practices.

Person Responsible	Jamie Marovich (marovich.jamie@brevardschools.org)

3. Teachers will identify SWD's and ELL's on their rosters, collaborate with ESE case managers, the ESOL contact, and other teachers about effective ESE/ELL strategies, and document ESE/ELL strategies with fidelity. These practices will ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs and promote more effective lesson planning and instruction.

Person Responsible	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)

4. Provide after-school tutoring for ESE and ELL students with ESE certified and ESOL Endorsed instructors.

Person Responsible	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)

5. Reading Plus will be used for progress-monitoring. Teachers will analyze results and consult with the literacy coach and ILA teachers to design appropriate interventions.

Person Responsible	Jamie Marovich (marovich.jamie@brevardschools.org)

6. The literacy coach will assist teachers in all subject areas with comprehensive interventions for struggling students, conduct small-group pull-out, conduct data chats and goal-setting in ILA classes, and FSA practice.

Person Responsible	Jamie Marovich (marovich.jamie@brevardschools.org)

7. Teachers will collaborate during common planning time and within CMA groups about methods to inspire, motivate, and celebrate the successes of the Lowest 25th Percentile.

Person Responsible	Jamie Marovich (marovich.jamie@brevardschools.org)

8. Use CARES Act funds to implement an ELA Bootcamp to assist students in preparing for the FSA ELA.

Person Responsible	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)

9. Setup a Google Site for ALL students to be able to access ELA test prep, helpful links, and other resources.

Person Responsible	Jamie Marovich (marovich.jamie@brevardschools.org)

10. Monitor ESE suspension rate through monthly reports and leadership discussion.

Person Responsible	Holly Hultgren (hultgren.holly@brevardschools.og)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

Based upon the Teacher Survey, Leadership and Learning Environments are rated as strengths with scores of 6.4. The BPS average was 5.8. A high number of 91% of teachers agree that the school leaders seek feedback from teachers, and 87% of teachers believe THS is a good place to learn; it is a safe and productive environment. THS will continue to work with the Leadership Team, which includes department chairs, to gather input for school-based decisions and procedures.

According to the Teacher Survey, an area for growth is Academic Opportunity. THS scored a 5.4, compared to a district average of 5.9. Only 43% of teachers use adopted materials and curriculum and only 48% of teachers believe students support their answers and explain their thinking. THS will address these areas through providing consistent feedback to teachers after informal observations and walk-throughs, specifically concerning high level questioning techniques and pushing students to utilize text-based evidence in their responses.

Based upon the Parent Survey, one strength is 86% of parents feel welcome at the school. Administration will continue to work with clerks and other staff on improving customer service skills, especially when parents first enter the campus. However, an area of growth is teacher communication with parents. 36% of parents feel that teachers NEVER communicate with them regarding their child's progress, and 51% of parents feel that teachers NEVER provide information on how to assist their child at home. THS has implemented a mandatory policy that teachers monitor grades on a weekly basis and contact parents when students are failing a class. This is a non-negotiable, and failure of teachers to do so will be reflected in teacher evaluations. THS has also increased communication to parents regarding accessing Focus, Google Classroom, and Launchpad by providing step-by-step, visual aids on the THS website with "How-To" tips. This information is also shared via Peachjar and Facebook.

Based upon the Student Survey, the percentage of students who feel they have a relationship with an adult in the school is above the district average, 39% vs. 37%, with 64% of students feeling there is at least one adult at the school willing to help them with a personal problem. An area for growth, however, is Student Culture. The BPS average for students believing it is a positive culture is 25%, with THS students at 18%. Only 19% of students feel that most adults in the school treat them with respect. THS is focusing on several strategies to increase this percentage. For example, during the course of the year, teachers will receive training on compassion fatigue, social emotional learning, and youth mental health. The goal is to prepare teachers to reach students on their level using concrete relational strategies. In addition, THS will continue to implement positive programs and events as allowed during the global pandemic and within social distancing constraints, such as virtual pep rallies, Spanish Heritage and African-American celebrations, Spirit Week, Student-of-the-Month, monthly Terrier Top Dogs (for students showing improvements), and monthly Outstanding Young Adult awards.

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**