Edward H. White High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edward H. White High School

1700 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD N, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/edwhite

Demographics

Principal: Traci Battest

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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

Edward H. White High School

1700 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD N, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/edwhite

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

To provide an environment that promotes academic excellence, inspires leadership, and strengthens physical, mental, social and emotional well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for Edward H. White High School students to be prepared for success as well-rounded leaders through rigorous instruction, enrichment activities, respectful interaction, effective discipline and community service

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Battest, Traci	Principal	Oversees the educational, operational, and financial needs of the school.
Wright, Dishon	Assistant Principal	Assists and supervise of operations of the school.
Reising, Abraham	Assistant Principal	Assists and supervise the curriculum of the school
Wells-Young, Tiara	Teacher, ESE	Lead teacher for Supported Level Academics and Postsecondary Transition Students.
Terrell, Anastasia	Teacher, K-12	Magnet Coordinator, recruiting and building a base of college-going graduates.
Nightingale, Latosha	Instructional Coach	Reading, ELA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/28/2020, Traci Battest

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.*
31

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
80

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429	465	349	278	1521
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	85	58	47	312
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
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	197	160	117	55	529
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	24	12	55	101

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	468	455	295	302	1520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	12	3	4	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	142	40	14	222
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238	203	110	104	655

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	72	14	2	4	92

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	22	4	1	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	12

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	468	455	295	302	1520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	12	3	4	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	72	36	1	189
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238	203	110	104	655

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	244	272	206	126	848

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	21	15	3	1	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	12

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	34%	47%	56%	23%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	48%	51%	34%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	42%	42%	35%	39%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	39%	51%	51%	48%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	40%	52%	48%	50%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	45%	55%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	52%	65%	68%	53%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	70%	73%	52%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	29%	48%	-19%	55%	-26%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	35%	48%	-13%	53%	-18%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	67%	-18%	67%	-18%
2018	49%	63%	-14%	65%	-16%

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	68%	-17%	70%	-19%
2018	52%	64%	-12%	68%	-16%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	57%	-33%	61%	-37%
2018	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
Compare		-25%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	61%	-20%	57%	-16%
2018	37%	57%	-20%	56%	-19%
Compare		4%			

Subgroup Data

				2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS							
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	27	28	35	32	29	39	44		85	49
ELL	14	24	14	33			27	42			
ASN	52	52		71	64		70	73		95	95
BLK	28	37	26	34	39	45	47	50		91	76
HSP	33	25	13	34	12		45	56		91	75
MUL	42	52		50			73			85	82
WHT	47	51	62	48	47	45	64	67		82	83
FRL	31	37	28	39	40	41	51	49		88	77

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	31	45	37	39	45		45	46		75	21
ELL	9	36	30								
ASN	50	52		45	50					92	100
BLK	27	46	43	39	48	40	43	43		89	70
HSP	40	48	33	54	67		58	48		89	56
MUL	35	50		31				82		70	
WHT	50	50	32	58	67		72	80		72	63
FRL	32	46	41	44	55	45	49	51		84	65

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	9	32	25	30	48	33	30	23		49	59
ELL	13	31									
ASN	36	38		55				80			
BLK	18	32	32	44	50	59	46	46		81	77
HSP	30	38	50	74	68		80	58		80	85
MUL	17	22		38	27		36	70		100	90
WHT	33	40	40	52	50	33	64	57		71	75
FRL	21	34	31	48	54	57	50	43		75	81

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
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	47
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	43
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	64
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	60
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

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Due to COVID-19, this question is answered using 2019 data. ELA Learning Gains were the lowest-performing component. The barriers attributing to this low performance include a new Instructional Coach and new teachers in ELA accountability areas, an ELA teacher on FMLA, a new administration and leadership team, primarily who were not ELA content area educators. This initial calibration year for the ELA department and leadership team did not show growth in ELA Learning Gains as they were acclimating to being a cohesive ELA team.

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

Due to COVID-19, this question is answered using 2019 data. Algebra I proficiency decreased by 25%. This decrease is mainly in response to the scheduling of lower-level students in remedial math classes the previous year, in addition to three new teachers in Algebra 1.

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

Due to COVID-19, this question is answered using 2019 data. Algebra I proficiency was also the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This gap was mainly caused by lower-level students in remedial math classes the previous year in addition to 3 new teachers in Algebra I.

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

Due to COVID-19, this question is answered using 2019 data. Geometry proficiency showed most improvement. The school intentionally placed seasoned, Geometry-minded, teachers with double blocked students in Geometry and intensive math to support improvements in this area.

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

Based on the EWS data from Part I, the school is concerned with the increase in the number of students requiring ELA retakes and the number of 11th graders needing a concordant score in Math due to lack of testing opportunities from COVID-19. Also, the number of students that have two or more early warning indicators is above previous years.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Reading Bottom Qrt Gains
3. Algebra I Bottom Qrt Gains
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our focus will be to ensure effective teacher planning, resulting in appropriately aligned standards-based instruction and tasks. During the 19-20 school year, fewer than 50% of our teachers demonstrated mastery of standards-based instructional planning aligned to tasks and assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Based upon the instructional alignment rubric, the vast majority of teachers will create standards-based instruction as measured by the Standards-Based Walk-through Tool.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Traci Battest (rogerst3@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the Learning Arc Framework, and the Standards-Based Walkthrough tool, teachers and administrators will engage in high quality Common Planning and Professional Learning Communities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Opportunity Myth, it is our professional responsibility to ensure students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, and to ensure their preparedness for assessments designed by the state in addition to the following years progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly professional development/common planning will provide strategies and facilitate methods of implementation for teachers.

Person Responsible	Leon Mungin (munginl1@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will conduct consistent observations and Classroom Walkthroughs (guided by the SWT), providing glows and grows.

Person Responsible	Traci Battest (rogerst3@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will participate in instructional rounds quarterly to observe student discourse and standards-based cross-curricular instructional design.

Person Responsible	Abraham Reising (reisinga@duvalschools.org)

Leadership team will identify and discuss recent educational peer-reviewed publications to identify topics for professional development monthly.

Person Responsible	Tiara Wells-Young (wellst@duvalschools.org)

Accountability area PMA data will be analyzed quarterly to identify further strategic needs in professional development as it relates to instructional design.

Person Responsible	Anastasia Terrell (terrella@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will model, participate, and facilitate common planning weekly, gradually releasing the ownership to team members.

Person Responsible	Traci Battest (rogerst3@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2020 5Essentials survey shows the vast majority of Students indicated the need to focus on increasing the Supportive Environment in the school. Specifically, these survey results identify a need for building student-teacher relationships.
Measurable Outcome:	Vast majority of teachers will build effective and appropriate student-teacher relationships that provide a supportive and safe learning environment. This outcome will be measured using results from the 2021 5Essentials student surveys, in which we expect to see at least a 10 percent increase in Student-Teacher Trust.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leon Mungin (munginl1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schoolwide PBIS initiatives will be implemented to boost both student and teacher morale by providing support through homeroom teams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS increases the school's climate and culture through promoting positive interactions between teachers and students. Specifically enhancing education-focused attitudes, character-building, student attendance initiatives, and post-seconda ry life readiness.

Action Steps to Implement

Activities Committee will plan school events promoting an increase in teacher and student morale.

Person Responsible	Traci Battest (rogerst3@duvalschools.org)

Safety & Civility Committee will organize whole-school PBIS expectations and rewards for meeting such expectations.

Person Responsible	Leon Mungin (munginl1@duvalschools.org)

Climate & Culture Committee will analyze current school systems and implement strategies to increase student and teacher morale, thus building relationships and ensuring students understand the concept of "I am my brother's keeper".

Person Responsible	Leon Mungin (munginl1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

• Core Subject Area Teachers (Math, Science, Social Studies) - Title I funds will be utilized to provide additional core subject area teachers to reduce class size so teachers are better able to differentiate instruction to meet individual student needs. In offering more truly differentiated instruction in the core subject areas, student achievement will be increased in those areas.
• Dean - Title I funds will be used to fund a Dean to help improve student engagement in the classrooms.
• Instructional Coaches (Math and Reading) - Title I funds will be used to fund Instructional Coaches in several subject areas to provide teachers with the support needed to address differentiation and implementation of standards-based instruction in the classroom. Instructional Coaches will also provide teachers the opportunity to participate in coaching cycles and training to address specific areas of need as it relates to student achievement.
• Supplies - Title I funds will be used to purchase assorted supplies needed by faculty and staff such as paper, pencils, pens, etc. These supplies are needed to support student achievement.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Edward H White High School ensures that all stakeholders have adequate contributions to the improvement and successes of our students. The administration and leadership team models the importance of maintaining positive moral and culture by working cohesively as a commander family. This includes celebrating milestones in the classroom, life, and career. We utilize our leadership classes to gather student insight on school culture and seek suggestions to further improve the school's environment. We encourage moral within our faculty and staff through faculty/staff bonding events, Sunshine Committee celebrations, and building relationships through PLCs and Common Planning groups. The school also provides ample opportunities for stakeholders to address their concerns and provide solutions through SAC, PTSA, PBIS, and parent involvement outreach through CHS. We encourage all stakeholders to provide their insight as to what will be best for the culture and climate of our school as well as the academic successes of our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$129,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$47,000.00
			Notes: Provides effective planning for professional development. Help teachers disaggregate state standards. Model pedagogical strategies in reading			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$47,000.00
			Notes: Provides effective planning for professional development. Help teachers disaggregate state standards. Model pedagogical strategies in mathematics			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$17,800.00
			Notes: Provides effective planning for professional development. Help teachers disaggregate state standards. Model pedagogical strategies in reading			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$17,800.00
			Notes: Provides effective planning for professional development. Help teachers disaggregate state standards. Model pedagogical strategies in mathematics			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$66,894.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6100	120-Classroom Teachers	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$48,757.00
			Notes: Provide students with a positive supportive environment and develops relationship-building strategies for teachers. Implement a positive behavior management system and tracks data for its effectiveness.			
	6100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2481 - Edward H. White High School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$18,137.00
					Total:	$196,494.00