

Volusia County Schools

University High School



2022-23 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

University High School

1000 W RHODE ISLAND AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://www.uhstitans.com/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">90%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">51%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chenoweth, Karen	Principal	Principal monitors school-wide data, instructional focus, and every aspect of the school.
Grieve, Bobbie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum. Oversees curriculum needs of teachers, facilitates PLCs campus wide, Advanced Placement, AVID, Cambridge, Testing, New Teacher Induction Program, Interns, School Improvement Plan and Professional Learning. Monitors school-wide data throughout the school year. Evaluates teachers on campus. Focus area is math and reading.
Boles, Chester	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant Principal - monitors the early warning system reports and master schedule. Oversees school counselors and graduation. Evaluates teachers on campus. Focus area is social studies.
Carter, Ben	Assistant Principal	Discipline Assistant Principal - oversees safety and security, athletics, activities and facilities. Evaluates teachers on campus. Focus area is ELA.
Hughes, Jennie	Assistant Principal	ESE Assistant Principal - oversees IEPs, compliance, and all ESE programs on the campus. Evaluates teachers on campus. Focus area is ESE.
Berner, Linda	Reading Coach	Reading Coach - implements professional development for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one on one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyze Achieve 3000, FSA, EOC, and district assessments to determine student placement in appropriate course and coordinates the school-wide literacy plan. Focus area ELA and reading.
Lastowski, William	Teacher, K-12	Cambridge Coordinator - oversees the Cambridge program at the school and monitors data for all Cambridge diploma candidates
Marracino, Laura	School Counselor	Director of School Counseling
Dawson, Kristen	Math Coach	Math Coach - provides one on one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyze EOC and district assessments to determine student placement in appropriate course. Focus area Algebra and Geometry
Lewitt, Jodi	Dean	Administrative TOA - works closely with the Curriculum Assistant Principal to oversee PLCs, testing, school data, and professional learning.
Cunningham, Kerry	Assistant Principal	Discipline Assistant Principal - oversees custodial, CTE and ESOL. Evaluates teachers on campus. Focus area is ESOL and CTE.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taylor, Nikolitsa	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Facilitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Karen Chenoweth

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

155

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,919

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

30

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

38

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758	688	565	635	2646
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	192	163	368	905
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	96	60	36	335
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	141	102	129	425
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	97	68	118	324
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271	211	121	108	711
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	101	79	70	439
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	59	15	13	132

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	204	219	157	223	803

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	42	71	35	51	199
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	31	11	25	87

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/28/2022

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	853	719	623	542	2737
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	87	114	106	85	392
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0	259	120	100	51	530
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	0	99	110	60	8	277
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	55	32	10	135

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	853	719	623	542	2737
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	87	114	106	85	392
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0	259	120	100	51	530
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	46%	51%				51%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						49%	49%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						34%	37%	42%
Math Achievement	28%	33%	38%				50%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains	41%						49%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						37%	38%	45%
Science Achievement	63%	30%	40%				78%	76%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	40%	48%				73%	69%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	77%	72%	5%	67%	10%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	63%	9%	70%	2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	37	29	14	35	42	28	42		80	49
ELL	15	27	20	13	37	55	30	31		90	79
ASN	61	58		28	35		89	70		100	84
BLK	28	34	32	22	43	56	44	57		88	60
HSP	39	42	23	22	38	49	54	55		92	75
MUL	51	55		40	50		76	87		92	82
WHT	52	53	34	33	42	42	69	73		92	79
FRL	38	42	28	24	37	44	56	61		89	74
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

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
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

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%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
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	57
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 high achieving students are meeting expectations but our middle of the road, lowest quartile and ESSA subgroup (SWD) students are not meeting expectations across all content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

We need to increase student achievement in all content areas for our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroup (SWD).

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

Because we saw our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroup (SWD) score lower than the rest of the student body, we decided to focus on student achievement in all content areas. We will focus on student engagement and standards-based instruction. Coaches and administrators will conduct walkthroughs looking for student engagement strategies and standards-based instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Acceleration and graduation rate

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

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 exam, or we pushed students to take AP, Cambridge and/or dual enrollment classes. Counselors and the Data AP were tracking the Project10 data weekly and there were also monthly cohort meetings using Project10 data as well.

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

Structured PLC time with a focus on student achievement in all content areas, standards-aligned instruction, progress monitoring and student engagement. Teachers will 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.

PLC training - the focus this school year will be on making sure PLC are making sure lessons are aligned to the curriculum map and standards-based instruction and using the data to drive instruction in regards to remediation and/or interventions

Student engagement - will focus on implementing Kagan strategies

Progress monitoring - PLCs will using formative and summative data, and district data to progress monitor and make adjustments to instruction based off the data

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

Continue with the cohort teams (administration, school counselors, teachers, and coaches) to progress monitor. Administrators will be assigned to specific PLCs to help guide and progress monitor with the teachers

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This Area of Focus aligns to VCS Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of earning EVERY day. AS a result of Needs Assessment and Analysis, it was determined that we need to increase student achievement in all content areas. With our main focus being on our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroup (SWD).

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase FSA ELA Grade 9 from 42% to meet the state average of 51%
 Increase FSA ELA Grade 10 from 46% to meet the state average of 49%
 Increase Algebra from 15% to 30%
 Increase Geometry from 32% to meet the state average of 50%
 Increase Biology from 60% to 70%
 Increase US History from 65% to 75%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction will be monitored by the following:
 - Progress monitoring of district assessments
 - Progress monitoring of CSPM
 - Course grades - including common formative and summative assessments
 - Monitoring PLC documentation
 - Use of curriculum maps, with emphasis on standards-aligned instruction

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our evidence-based strategy is using John Hattie's Teacher Clarity with an effect size of .75.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75. The average effect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .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 deliver of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students
 - provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Share with the entire faculty and staff the 21-22 state assessment data and school grade. Discuss the area of focus this school year needs to be on standards-aligned instruction to increase student achievement in all content areas and this will be accomplished through student engagement.

Person Responsible

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

Teachers using the curriculum map with the focus on the standards/benchmarks. Implementing Titan Targets and Success Criteria for students daily.

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

Progress monitoring of district assessments and CSPM within PLCs. Administration and coaches will provide feedback and monitored teacher improvement.

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

Frequent walkthroughs by administrators and academic coaches

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

Monitoring of PLCs with the emphasis on standards-aligned instruction in all content areas

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This Area of Focus aligns to VCS Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of earning EVERY day. AS a result of Needs Assessment and Analysis, it was determined that we need to increase student achievement in all content areas. With our main focus being on our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroup (SWD).
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: Increase FSA ELA Grade 9 from 42% to meet the state average of 51%
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. Increase FSA ELA Grade 10 from 46% to meet the state average of 49%
This should be a data based, objective outcome. Increase Algebra from 15% to 30%
 Increase Geometry from 32% to meet the state average of 50%
 Increase Biology from 60% to 70%
 Increase US History from 65% to 75%

Monitoring: The Instructional Practice specifically relating to student engagement will be monitored by the following:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
 - Progress monitoring of district assessments
 - Progress monitoring of CSPM
 - Frequent walkthroughs with of focus on student engagement strategies (emphasis on student voice)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is Kagan Structures to increase student voice in all content areas.
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Implementing Kagan Structures within in the classroom allows for more opportunities for student voice. When student voice is used in the classroom, student engagement is activated and when student engagement is activated learning takes place and student achievement increases.
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Share with the entire faculty and staff the 21-22 state assessment data and school grade. Discuss the area of focus this school year needs to be on standards-aligned instruction to increase student achievement in all content areas and this will be accomplished through student engagement.

Professional Learning on student engagement strategies, Kagan Structures in particular PLCs have common planning to collaborate on pacing, standards-based instruction, and student engagement strategies with an emphasis on Kagan Structures.

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

Provide professional learning throughout the school year on student engagement strategies, with emphasis on Kagan Structures.

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

Frequent walkthroughs by administrators and academic coaches looking for student engagement strategies being utilized in the classroom. Coaches will use walkthroughs to look for Kagan Structures to be implemented and when they are not found in a classroom, the coaches will help the teacher to implement Kagan Structures into their classroom.

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

Progress monitoring of district assessments and CSPM within PLCs to make sure teachers are on pace, using standards-based instruction and student engagement strategies. Administration and coaches will provide feedback and monitor teacher improvement.

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 weaknesses and our strengths in regard to building a positive school culture and environment. SGA hosts quarterly pep rallies, club rush week, homecoming events, and spirit weeks to help promote school spirit throughout the school year. We have a mental health counselor onsite to help with student SEL and our career and college counselor helps students with career and college questions, and organizes Colleges and University's to come to campus to have college visits. Monthly CREED Awards that recognize teachers for one of the four: strength, knowledge, courage, and respect. Monthly New 2 U lunch and learn meetings with all the new teachers on campus to help with retention.

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

We have implemented the following programs to promote a positive school culture and environment:

- The Creed Awards: administration, teachers, and staff
- Instruction of The Creed: administration and teachers
- PBIS Team
- New 2 U: Curriculum AP and academic coaches
- Parent Engagement - SAC, Athletic and Academic meetings
- Social Media: administration and activity director
- Career and College counselor
- SGA school spirit
- Homeless Liaison