University High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

University High School

1000 W RHODE ISLAND AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://www.uhstitans.com/

Demographics

Principal: Karen Chenoweth   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 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 (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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	

* 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 Volusia 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

University High School

1000 W RHODE ISLAND AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://www.uhstitans.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

At University High School we believe in the promise of every student. We are committed to preparing students for success in a rapidly changing world. Together we are a vibrant, close-knit learning community of diverse backgrounds, talent and perspectives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In concurrence with Volusia County's vision statement, "Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society."

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chenoweth, Karen	Principal	Principal monitors school-wide data, instructional focus, and every aspect of the school.
Boles, Chester	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant Principal - monitors the early warning system reports, monitors data progress with student overall numbers, master schedule, oversees guidance, evaluates teachers, facilitator of the PLCs within the social studies department, and makes recommendations for adjustments in the School Improvement Plan.
Carter, Ben	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Facilities and Discipline. Facilitator of all PLCs within the English and World Languages departments, evaluates teachers, and in charge of discipline.
Grieve, Bobbie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum. Oversees curriculum needs, teachers, and facilitator of all the PLCs within in the Math, Physical Education, and Reading departments. New Teacher Induction Program, interns, evaluates teachers, AP Program, Cambridge, Professional Learning, SIP ILT and oversees testing.
Hughes, Jennie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of students with exceptionalities. Oversees IEPs, compliance, evaluates teachers, and in charge of all ESE programs.
Berner, Linda	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach - implements professional development for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing Achieve 3000 and Reading 180, FSA, EOC and district assessments to determine student placement in appropriate course adn coordinates the school-wide literacy plan, member of the Instructional Leadership Team, in classrooms modeling, supports PLCs for Reading, AVID and ELA.
Lastowski, William	Teacher, K-12	Cambridge Director, Science department chair and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
Marracino, Laura	School Counselor	Director of School Counseling department and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
McMann, Danielle	Dean	Administrative TOA , Discipline Dean, Testing Coordinator and supports Reading and ELA PLCs.
Lewitt, Jodi	Dean	Administrative TOA, Safety/Security, ESE Dean, Testing Coordinator and supports Math PLCs.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Goode, Mindy	Teacher, K-12	AVID Director and classroom teacher, oversees the implementation of AVID strategies schoolwide.
Ouellette, Christina	Teacher, K-12	ELA department chair, classroom teacher and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
Peel, Jennifer	Instructional Technology	DLTL of school, Career, College and Academy Director, CTE Director and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
Roman, Orlando	Teacher, K-12	Fine and Performing Arts department chair, classroom teacher and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
Ruggiero, Joe	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies department chair, classroom teacher and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
Lubbers, John	Teacher, K-12	ROTC Director, classroom teacher and member of the Instructional Leadership Team.
Dawson, Kristen	Math Coach	Math Coach, Math department chair and member of the Instructional Leadership Team. Supports Math PLCs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Karen Chenoweth

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
160

Total number of students enrolled at the school
2,737

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
30

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	853	719	623	542	2737
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
One or more suspensions	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	107	171	135	95	508
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	114	106	85	392
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	181	129	96	682
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	259	120	100	51	530
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	63	3	0	130

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	106	145	116	67	434

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	99	110	60	8	277
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	55	32	10	135

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	626	601	577	487	2291
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	172	140	118	68	498
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	126	75	43	376

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	101	81	52	24	258

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	75	59	51	20	205
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	51	45	16	142

2020-21 - 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	626	601	577	487	2291
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	172	140	118	68	498
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	126	75	43	376

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	101	81	52	24	258

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	75	59	51	20	205
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	51	45	16	142

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	52%	56%	52%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	49%	51%	50%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	37%	42%	47%	37%	44%
Math Achievement				50%	48%	51%	48%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				49%	49%	48%	55%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	38%	45%	47%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				78%	76%	68%	71%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	69%	73%	72%	66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	51%	50%	1%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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
2021					
2019	77%	72%	5%	67%	10%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	63%	9%	70%	2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We use a variety of progress monitoring tools:
- Project10
- District Assessments
- Previous years state assessment data

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			48
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			16
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			29
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			13
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			47
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			48
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			16
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			29
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			13
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			47
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			68
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			53
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	39	38	13	25	25	48	53		69	22
ELL	15	43	47	19	34	29	45	40		79	18
ASN	62	62		50	50					93	43
BLK	37	48	47	19	20	13	58	68		75	48
HSP	41	46	42	27	29	22	61	60		83	33

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	53	61		30	40		80	77		96	61
WHT	54	54	48	33	33	23	74	74		81	54
FRL	40	47	45	25	27	20	62	64		77	40
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	20	32	21	26	40	29	37	45		75	9
ELL	24	40	35	40	42	33	58	54		67	35
ASN	44	55		53	60		73			92	83
BLK	44	47	41	37	37	33	64	57		72	31
HSP	46	46	34	50	47	30	78	67		75	39
MUL	50	45	27	44	31		73	85		84	69
WHT	55	50	32	52	53	43	80	78		80	52
FRL	43	46	34	47	47	37	71	69		72	39
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	21	43	42	22	44	34	18	35		64	13
ELL	17	47	45	31	61	59	22	37		53	29
ASN	59	54		67							
BLK	32	42	38	35	43	37	57	64		79	33
HSP	46	47	45	42	51	49	58	63		78	42
MUL	62	55		58	64		64	77		83	32
WHT	57	53	52	52	58	48	80	79		77	50
FRL	43	47	43	44	53	47	61	68		72	36

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our ESSA subgroup of SWD is still performing below the 41% and both math and ELA are still below the state average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our under-performing subgroup is our students with disabilities. This is our ESSE group with only 34% of students showing success in state assessments. SWD 16% of students showing success in ELA and 13% showing proficiency in Math. We also had other subgroups that did not perform to our desire, but our lowest performing group was our ESE population. Last year UHS implemented the co-taught model, and experienced some growing pains with student engagement as well teacher retention in this area. UHS had three permanent subs in these positions during the data collection year. We had some successful instructional models within co-taught classrooms, but we didn't see the embracement and desire to grow. Our focus has been on training, coaching, collaborating and modeling as we enter the new school year. We were very purposeful with implementing collaborative teams this year and allowing the teachers to be part of the selection of teams.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Our focus still needs to be on math and ELA with an extra focus on our SWD. We have moved from a co-taught model to a support facilitation model in hopes to see our SWD increase in all areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Acceleration points and graduation rate
We used Project10 monthly data to track graduation rate and had the CTE facilitator pull monthly reports to track our acceleration points.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Better tracking of both categories, CTE facilitator pulled reports and made sure to have as many students sit for an industry certification or to make sure they were in AP, Cambridge or Dual Enrollment course. Counselors and the Data AP were tracking the Project10 data weekly to make sure as many students as possible graduated on time.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Structured PLC time with a focus on student achievement and progress monitoring. Teachers should utilize Max Minutes by targeting students who need specific remediation to keep students moving forward. Support facilitation teachers will work with classroom teachers to track and monitor SWD.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teacher Clarity is going to be a main focus this school year and structured PLC time
Data analysis of district progress monitoring assessments (SMT, DIA, UA and VLT) as part of the structured PLC time.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Cohort teams will be developed this school year that will include administration, school counselors, teachers and coaches to progress monitor using the Project10 to make sure all students graduate.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math proficiency was 29%, Math Learning Gains was 31%, and the Lowest Quartile was 22%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis showed that Algebra and our ESSA subgroup SWD was underperforming.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math overall proficiency from 29% to 42% Increase Math learning gains from 31% to 44% Increase Math lowest quartile from 22% to 35%
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific math look-fors, monitoring of PLC meetings, agenda and minutes, feedback from district learning walks and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches and the district support team. PLC and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students" learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. at 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: - have appropriately high expectations - share their notions of success criteria with their students - ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment - ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students - provide welcome feedback about where to move to next

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs

Person Responsible	Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Titan Targets and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible	Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLC meetings that include planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked

examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students and data analysis to see what is working and what needs to be fixed or changed.

Person Responsible   Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions:
- Where are we going?
- Where are we now?
- How do we move learning forward?
- What did we learn today?
- Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible   Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLC focused on identifying Titan Targets, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and invite them to Max Minutes for target interventions.

Person Responsible   Kristen Dawson (kadawson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 48%, ELA Learning Gains were 51%, and the Lowest Quartile performed at 46%, which was below the district and state average.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA overall proficiency from 48% to 61% Increase ELA learning gains from 51% to 64% Increase ELA lowest quartile from 46% to 59%
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors, monitoring of PLC meetings, agenda and minutes, feedback from district learning walks and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ben Carter (bwcarter@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches and the district support team. PLC and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students" learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. at 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: - have appropriately high expectations - share their notions of success criteria with their students - ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment - ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students - provide welcome feedback about where to move to next

Action Steps to Implement	
Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.	
Person Responsible	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs	
Person Responsible	Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Titan Target and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.	
Person Responsible	Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Weekly PLC meetings that include planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked	

examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students and data analysis to see what is working and what needs to be fixed or changed.

Person Responsible   Ben Carter (bwcarter@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions:
- Where are we going?
- Where are we now?
- How do we move learning forward?
- What did we learn today?
- Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible   Ben Carter (bwcarter@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLC focused on identifying Titan Targets, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful and invite them to Max Minutes for target interventions.

Person Responsible   Linda Berner (lmberner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ESSA subgroup SWD is below proficiency both in ELA and Math with an overall score of 34%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our ESSA subgroup SWD from 34% to 47%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthrough tools with specific ESE strategies and look-fors, data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, we have changed from a co-taught model to a support facilitation model for our SWD students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hughes (jlhughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement and support our new support facilitation model and provide continuous and well planned training, modeling and coaching for both core teachers and support facilitation teachers. Additionally, both the core teachers and the support facilitation teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to discuss student data, provide feedback and implement instructional strategies to support SWD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that SWD benefit from teachers working together to make the curriculum more accessible to all students. DuFour's research is noted for developing strategies to create collaborative teaching environments and increase teacher efficacy. DuFour linked increases in student achievement to schools where there was a shared vision of leadership (administrative support in focus PLCs,) where each member of the learning community contributed, and where teachers collectively planned, reflected, and analyzed data to drive instruction ad remediation.

Action Steps to Implement

Training and implementation for the support facilitation model within the PLC
Both support facilitation teachers and classroom teachers will focus on data analysis of district progress monitoring assessments (SMT, DIA UA, and VLT) as part of the tracking of SWD

Person Responsible	Jennie Hughes (jlhughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ILT determines the FOCUS for areas of need for monthly training.

Person Responsible	Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers are trained to identify lowest quartile, access data using common assessments, analyze performance by standards, determine remediation, reassess, and follow through with continuous monitoring of student progress.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hughes (jlhughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration is in classes weekly for drop-ins, support PLC weekly, learning walks and support facilitation teachers to give feedback and support.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hughes (jlhughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified violent incidents as an area of concern. It is ranked as very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:
School will:
- identify mentors for students with high incidents in violence
- provide incident data to teachers monthly at faculty meetings
- the discipline AP conducted grade level meetings to discuss FortifyFL app
Teachers will:
- stand at door during the beginning and end of school and at class change to monitor students
Data chats will take place quarterly during faculty meetings to discuss the above implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on the data.

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.

The school looks at the data provided by the faculty and student climate survey along with the Panorama survey to see our areas of weakness and strengths in regards to building a positive school culture and environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

SAC - community involvement and support - all stakeholders
Sunshine Committee - creating a positive atmosphere and activities for teachers
Creed program - recognizing both students and faculty members (Knowledge, Strength, Courage and Respect)
AVID - community and parent involvement
SEL - campus wide (school counselors and administration)
Recognizing academic and athletic successes for our students (administration, athletic director and coaches)

CTE programs involving community members and business partners
New 2 U - new teacher monthly meeting
SGA - organizes pep rallies, school spirit activities and events throughout the school year

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00