

Brevard Public Schools

Titusville High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 23 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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: 6/10/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 55% |
| 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 (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: 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 | |

* 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 23 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| High School PK, 9-12 | No | 54% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 41% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Burgess, Barbara | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader by providing relevant, research-based instructional strategies to teachers. Engage stakeholders through school events and forums such as the school website and other social media forums. Collaborate in the school's decision-making process through leadership team meetings. Implement a systematic monitoring system of CMA groups and their work on instructional practices and implementation. Implement school safety measures and monitor effectiveness throughout the year. |
| LeGate , Heather | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader by providing relevant, research-based instructional strategies to teachers. Engage stakeholders through school events such as parent open house and conferences. in the school's decision-making process through leadership team meetings. Implement a school-wide tutoring calendar to offer extra interventions to struggling students. |
| Hultgren, Holly | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader by providing relevant, research-based instructional strategies to teachers. Engage stakeholders by developing relationships with business partners. Collaborate in the school's decision-making process through leadership team meetings. Implement school-wide restorative practices to assist with school discipline. Implement school-wide PBIS to improve student attendance and engagement. |
| Gonzalez, Jennifer | Principal | Serve as an instructional leader in the school by providing feedback on practices and professional development on research-based instructional strategies. Engage stakeholders through surveys, community events, and the SAC. Collaborate in the school's decision-making process through school and community committees. |
| Marovich, Jamie | Reading Coach | Serve as an instructional teacher leader by working with various teachers on classroom teaching strategies-- specifically reading strategies. Assist with teacher data analysis and performance matters reports. Develop plans for students needing concordant testing scores to meet graduation requirements. Collaborate in the school's decision-making process through leadership team meetings. |
| Lawrence, Wayne "Larry" | Other | Build relationships with students, teachers, and parents through constructive conversations and mentoring practices. Collaborate in the school's decision-making process through leadership team meetings. Assist with the implementation of school-wide restorative practices to assist with school discipline. Assist with the implementation of school-wide PBIS to improve student attendance and engagement. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| Gaines, Alica | Other | Serve as an instructional teacher leader by supporting teachers with state testing and other mandated progress monitoring. Collaborating with teachers and administration on data and monitoring student deficiencies while providing opportunities for concordant testing. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/10/2019, 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,242

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.

8

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 | 377 | 338 | 281 | 246 | 1242 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 33 | 23 | 13 | 134 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 34 | 18 | 11 | 102 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 93 | 45 | 26 | 240 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 66 | 70 | 26 | 244 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 46 | 34 | 31 | 164 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 58 | 44 | 16 | 159 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 51 | 57 | 31 | 209 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 77 | 62 | 14 | 193 |
| | 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 | 53 | 54 | 45 | 14 | 166 |

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 | 11 | 13 | 20 | 21 | 65 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 22 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/10/2021

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 | 0 | 327 | 337 | 270 | 301 | 1235 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 | 54 | 36 | 27 | 16 | 133 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 | 36 | 40 | 21 | 16 | 113 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 23 | 55 | 44 | 12 | 134 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 24 |

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 | 0 | 327 | 337 | 270 | 301 | 1235 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 | 54 | 36 | 27 | 16 | 133 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 | 36 | 40 | 21 | 16 | 113 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 23 | 55 | 44 | 12 | 134 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 24 |

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 | | | | 58% | 59% | 56% | 59% | 58% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 47% | 52% | 51% | 47% | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 32% | 40% | 42% | 42% | 44% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 43% | 48% | 51% | 46% | 50% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 49% | 49% | 48% | 46% | 46% | 48% |

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 45% | 45% | 38% | 43% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 62% | 66% | 68% | 79% | 67% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 83% | 70% | 73% | 79% | 70% | 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 | 56% | 62% | -6% | 55% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 59% | 0% | 53% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| 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 | 66% | 66% | 0% | 67% | -1% |

| 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 | 85% | 71% | 14% | 70% | 15% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 31% | 61% | -30% | 61% | -30% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 46% | 60% | -14% | 57% | -11% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading Plus
MAPP

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 105/41% | 87/38% | 90/45% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 51/31% | 40/27% | 43/33% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/10% | 3/8% | 2/8% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/20% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 57/34% | 73/53% | 36/42% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30/31% | 30/41% | 20/36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/22% | 1/25% | 1/25% |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 149/49% | 133/50% | 105/47% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 73/41% | 65/41% | 52/40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/8% | 4/13% | 3/11% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/20% | 2/29% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 62/34% | 86/48% | 34/44% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28/25% | 42/41% | 19/40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/4% | 2/20% | 1/17% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/33% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 114/44% | 107/47% | 76/44% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43/31% | 41/34% | 26/28% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8/20% | 6/17% | 5/17% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/20% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 16/21% | 24/30% | 4/21% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9/3% | 15/24% | 2/14% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/10% | 4/18% | 1/14% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/33% | 3/50% | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 56/33% | 31/25% | 6/12% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 20/25% | 12/19% | 3/10% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 5/23% | 4/21% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 4/14% | 5/17% | 6/67% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 3/14% | 2/11% | 4/57% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0/0% | 0/0% | 1/33% |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Biology | All Students | | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| US History | All Students | | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

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 | 18 | 27 | 23 | 17 | 26 | 31 | 35 | 52 | | 67 | 10 |
| ELL | 30 | 50 | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | 45 | | | | | | | | 88 | 86 |
| BLK | 28 | 36 | 23 | 9 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 47 | | 75 | 41 |
| HSP | 44 | 42 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 25 | 60 | 74 | | 93 | 68 |

| 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 | 41 | 27 | 36 | 40 | 30 | 64 | 63 | | 88 | 76 |
| WHT | 61 | 46 | 30 | 40 | 23 | 21 | 65 | 86 | | 86 | 80 |
| FRL | 38 | 35 | 24 | 25 | 20 | 22 | 49 | 64 | | 81 | 63 |
| 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 |

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 | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 38 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 539 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 87% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 32 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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?

ELA scores in 9th and 10th grades declined by 2% and 7%. District and state scores also declined.

- a. SWD - declines in achievement levels (-5%), learning gains (-6%), and lowest 25% (-7%)
- b. ELL - increase in passing from 7% to 30% and learning gains from 13% to 50%
- c. Black- decrease in achievement levels (-12%) and learning gains (-3%)
- d. Hispanic - no change in achievement levels; increase in learning gains (+8%)
- e. Multiracial - increase in achievement levels (+1%) and learning gains (+3%)
- f. FRL - decrease in achievement levels (-6%) and learning gains (-5%)

Alg 1 and Geometry scores of 3 or higher both declined by 7%. District and state scores also declined.

- a. SWD - increases in achievement levels (+2%); decline in learning gains (-7%)
- b. Black - declines in achievement levels (-31%), learning gains (-24%) and lowest 25% (-14%).
- c. Hispanic - declines in achievement levels (-6%), learning gains (-25%) and lowest 25% (-15%).
- e. Multiracial - declines in achievement levels (-3%)%, learning gains (+3%)
- f. FRL - decrease in achievement levels (-6%), decrease in learning gains (-20%), lowest 25% (-17%)

History declined by 8%; THS outperformed district/state. SWD outperformed state by 14%.

Biology declined by 6%. Declines in district/state. SWD outperformed state by 9%.

Black subgroup declined 12% in ELA achievement, 14% in math, -5% in science; -16% in social studies. One-third were eLearners and many did not test.

Hispanic subgroup improved by 2% in science; declined by 4% in social studies.

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

Based upon current available 2021 data:

- 1. ELA achievement levels, learning gains, and progress of lowest 25% for the SWD, Black, and FRL subgroups in both 9th and 10th grades.

2. Math achievement, especially within the Black subgroup.
3. The performance of the the Black subgroup decreased significantly in all areas. A disproportionate number of blacks were eLearners at the end of the year (one-third) and many did not test.

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

1. Further specific monitoring in ELA courses is needed to determine whether or not subgroups are being provided with the supports they need in order to succeed. These supports are especially important during the 2022 school year. This is the first year of a new ELA/Intensive Reading curriculum and we are in the process of adopting new standards. Extra professional development with new curriculum, assistance from literacy coach and department chair in creating and implementing standards-based lessons, and strategic use of CMA groups.
2. After analyzing class assessment results, it is evident that some math classes had a high number of students who failed to take Algebra or Geometry EOCs. Therefore, we must ensure that additional strategies are implemented to ensure a higher number of tested students in 2022.
3. Another contributing factor towards the lack of math achievement continues to be that 3/4 of our Algebra and Geometry teachers have less than 5 years of teaching experience. We should continue to work with these teachers by offering professional development in behavior management strategies, completing the New Teacher Induction program and Academy, and other courses on instructional delivery/strategies.
4. Our black students are being suspended at a disproportionate rate and a disproportionate number participated in eLearning in 2021. Furthermore, many failed to come in for testing. THS must continue to provide professional development on culturally responsive teaching strategies.

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

1. Progress Monitoring through MAP data also demonstrated increased proficiency for each grade level from the first to third assessment window.
2. SWD improved performance in science and social studies.
3. Nearly all subgroups showed improvement in science and social studies achievement.

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

1. Extra support was provided to SWDs through specialized tutoring and check-ins with a certified ESE teacher. Support facilitation opportunities increased.
2. Extra support was provided to ELLs in Biology and US History through an ESOL Instructional Assistant and through specialized tutoring opportunities with an ESOL certified instructor.

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

1. THS will implement strategies, such as restorative practices and mental health lessons, to promote student belonging and social/emotional well-being. Additional mental health supports and community resources will be provided by a school-based social worker. An improved culture should contribute to increased attendance.
2. All students will have access to grade-level content across all subject areas and across all demographic subgroups. When inequities are identified, they will be addressed by creating equitable experiences, providing equitable access to resources, and thoughtful decisions. For example, subgroup performance data such as progress monitoring results, course performance, and standardized testing results will be used to ensure that students within targeted subgroups are placed in accelerated courses if students demonstrate the ability to achieve.
3. During classroom walkthroughs and observations, administration will analyze how teachers are addressing the learning needs of subgroups, provide feedback, and suggest additional strategies,

such as preferential seating, scaffolding, and closed notes.

4. CMA groups will be analyzing data related to grad rate and culture to determine what instructional strategies are working effectively.

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.

In order to promote student belonging and social/emotional well-being, THS will provide the following professional development opportunities:

1. Approximately 50% of our staff has completed the Youth Mental Health First Aid training. This year, the remaining 50% will be trained.

2. Verbal De-Escalation training will be provided to all staff during Professional Development Days.

3. SEL training will be provided to instructors during Professional Development Days.

To ensure that all students have access to the curriculum, including students who may be quarantined, literacy and technology training (blended learning) will be provided during Professional Development Days. Teachers will be provided training on targeted strategies, such as scaffolding and closed notes, to help students access curriculum.

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

1. For the 2021-2022 school year, teachers will be encouraged to attend trainings that support our SIP goals, including:

a. Bringing Accommodations to Life in the Classroom

b. CPI

c. ELA Lesson Study (self-paced)

d. Introduction to Differentiated Instruction

e. Technology for a Diverse Classroom

f. Technology to Support Reading Comprehension

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The graduation rate is benchmark #5 in the Brevard Public School's strategic plan. Since 2019, THS has seen a decline in graduation rate. The graduation rate in 2019 was 87.2%. In 2020, the graduation rate fell to 85.1%. In 2021, the graduation rate dropped further to 84.8%. Success in the classroom leads to course credit accrual, students meeting the GPA requirement, and higher performances on the 10th grade FSA ELA and Alg 1/Geom, all of which are requirements for graduation. In addition, regular attendance also plays a critical role towards students graduating on time. Last year, student attendance dropped significantly as a result of the impact of Covid, quarantined students, and students who elected eLearning. Absence from the classroom impacted student grades, test scores, and limited student access to school programming. The African-American subgroup had a disproportionately high number of students on eLearning at the end of the year (one-third) and many of these students did not test.

Measurable Outcome:

1. The overall graduation rate will increase to from 84.8% to 87%.
2. SWD grad rates will increase to 67% to 77%.
3. Black grad rates will increase from 75% to 85%.
4. FRL grad rates will increase from 81% to 85%.
5. ELL grad rates will maintain at 100%.
6. The attendance rate will increase from _____ to _____.

Monitoring:

All cohort years will be closely monitored by the Assistant Principals and the guidance department through monthly deficiency reports for credit, GPA, and attendance. Additionally, teachers will work in CMA groups to monitor student progress and design interventions, and the literacy coach will monitor student success on the ELA and Algebra assessments required for graduation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

According to Hattie's Visible Learning theory, response to intervention has an effect size of 1.06. Effect sizes over .40 equal a year's worth of student growth. RTI is not a specific program or type of teaching, but rather a proactive approach which measures students' skills and uses data to decide which interventions to use. There are three main goals of RTI:

1. Identifies students who are struggling;
2. Uses targeted teaching to help them catch up; and
3. Measures progress and provides more support to struggling students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to progressively increase the graduation rate at THS, students will need to be identified earlier in 9th, 10th, and 11th grades to receive targeted Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions. The resource used is John Hattie's Visible Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Using summative/formative assessment data, CMA groups will identify students in danger of failing due to lack of academic progress and/or attendance. Student achievement goals will be created using quality Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions. Students will be referred to guidance/IPST if needed.
2. Students with <2.0 GPA and/or credit/testing deficient will be targeted to receive:
 - a. After-school tutoring and credit retrieval by certified teachers.
 - b. ESE students will receive special weekly tutoring opportunities with an ESE teacher

certified in English, math, and social sciences.

c. Walk-in peer math tutoring during lunch in the media center by NHS members.

d. Boot camps during the school day and after school to assist juniors/seniors in preparation for concordant testing in ELA/Alg/Geo.

3. Students who demonstrate a lack of progress towards Geometry goals will receive remediation through the use of additional practice opportunities embedded in the curriculum and through remediation software.

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

4. The literacy coach will host data chats with testing-deficient students at least once per semester to discuss progress, set goals, create individual action plans, and identify resources needed, such as teachers, study guides, online resources.

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

5. Professional development designed to assist teachers with a variety of interventions will be provided on early release Fridays on topics including literacy instruction, blended learning, de-escalation techniques, scaffolding, and social-emotional learning strategies.

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

6. Additional instruction will be provided to ESE students and the lowest 25% through an additional ESE Learning Strategies class and a Leadership class that focuses on tutoring and restorative practices.

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

7. THS will allocate a school social worker to assist with attendance by monitoring struggling students, making home visits, meeting weekly with high-risk students, referring families to outside resources, creating individual plans for students, and overseeing an IPST process for attendance. In addition, a parent liaison will be hired to assist the social worker in these goals.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Titusville High School reported 3.6 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the statewide high school rate of 3.3 incidents per 100 students. THS is ranked "high" for violent incidents (#375/505), and "middle" for drug incidents (#284/505). Additionally, THS is ranked "high" for suspensions (#362/505).

The Assistant Principal of discipline will run monthly reports to monitor suspension rates, offenses, and risk ratio data. Additionally, the Assistant Principal of discipline will work with the PBIS team to incorporate positive behavior referrals and other reward systems to promote appropriate behaviors. The administration will use and assist teachers with restorative practices and relationship building to prevent inappropriate behaviors and ultimately out of school suspensions. Administration will continue to seek feedback from teachers, students, and parents to continue building a strong culture.

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.

Titusville High Administration reaches out to all stakeholders through the use of the Insight Survey, Youth Truth student survey, Parent survey, as well as through meetings with community members and local businesses both on and off campus. The SAC committee and Parent survey are used to communicate with parents and other stakeholders. At THS we strive to include all stakeholders in the decision making processes and in feedback to improve the culture of the school and increase our graduation rate. According to the student Youth Truth Survey, only 29% of students feel they have a positive relationship with a staff member. Armed with this data, THS is implementing restorative practices and a PBIS program. Additionally, all teachers will take part in de-escalation training. The addition of restorative practices, PBIS, and staff training will promote positive relationships and communication between students and staff. According to the teacher Insight Survey, only 47% of teachers feel there are consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior. THS is implementing a Teacher Handbook and a Student Handbook with specific policies and procedures for all staff and students that outline expectations and consequences for student behavior. Additionally, a School Climate Committee is meeting monthly to discuss concerns and collaborate with administration to resolve issues and ensure school-wide consistency. According to the Parent Survey, 39% of parents feel teachers never communicate with them regarding their child's progress. THS is implementing a school-wide policy for teachers to call parents whenever a student is in danger of failing. Additionally, teachers are required to update FOCUS at least 1 time per week with

grades. Teachers are also required to update their FOCUS webpages for each class they teach with a course syllabus and any other resources that are helpful to parents and students.

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

School administration will continue to utilize restorative practices and coach and support teachers to do the same. Teachers will support the use of restorative practices and give positive behavior referrals whenever possible. De-escalation, as well as other Restorative Practice professional developments, will be attended by all teachers throughout the school year. Teachers will observe peers with students to help with ideas for restorative practices that they can implement. Parents and community members will continue to give feedback at the SAC meetings and support our efforts with reinforcement at home.