

Volusia County Schools

# University High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement**

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

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

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

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chenoweth, Karen	Principal	<p>The school-based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Principal (Mrs. Karen Chenoweth)- monitors school-wide data, instructional focus, and every aspect of the school</li> <li>* Assistant Principal of Curriculum (Melissa Fraine) - monitors Professional Learning Community work, provides assistance with data analysis and coordinates the school's professional development plan</li> <li>* Data Assistant Principal (Mr. Boles)- monitors the early warning system reports, monitors data progress with student overall numbers, master schedule and makes recommendations for adjustments in the School Improvement Plan</li> <li>* Literacy Coach - implements professional development for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing FAIR, FSA, EOC, DIA, SMT and Volusia Writes data to determine student placement in appropriate course and coordinates the school-wide literacy plan, s in classrooms daily modeling and helping teachers grow in their practice</li> <li>* Department Chairs - provide content specific professional development, review and provide feedback on the school literacy and school-wide professional development plans</li> </ul>
Boles, Chester	Assistant Principal	<p>Data Assistant Principal - monitors the early warning system reports, monitors data progress with student overall numbers, master schedule, oversees guidance, evaluates teachers, facilitator for Social Studies PLC, and makes recommendations for adjustments in the School Improvement Plan</p>
Carter, Ben	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistance Principal of facilities and discipline. Oversees advisors, facilities, English 3 &amp; 4 PLC, Foreign Language PLC, AVID, evaluates teachers, and in charge of discipline.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fraine, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistance Principal of curriculum. Oversees curriculum needs, teachers, facilitates English 1 & 2 PLC, All math PLCs, New Teacher Program, interns, evaluates teachers, Career Colleges, AP Program, Cambridge, Professional Learning, SIP, ILT, and oversees testing.
Hughes, Jennie	Assistant Principal	Assistance Principal of students with Exceptionalities. Oversees IEPs, compliance, evaluates teachers, and in charge of all ESE programs including co-taught.
Berner, Linda	Instructional Coach	* Literacy Coach - implements professional development for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one-on-one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzing FAIR, FSA, EOC and Volusia Writes data to determine student placement in appropriate course and coordinates the school-wide literacy plan, member of Instructional Leadership Team, in classrooms modeling, supports PLCs for reading, AVID, and ELA
Goode, Mindy	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and AVID Director. Guides school with implementation of AVID strategies
Lastowski, William	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Biology teacher, Science Department Chair, and Cambridge Director. Member of Instructional Leadership Team
Marracino, Laura	Guidance Counselor	Director of Guidance and member of Instructional Leadership Team
Ouellette, Christina	Teacher, K-12	English 4 classroom teacher, member of Instructional Leadership Team, and ELA Department Chair.
Peel, Jennifer	Instructional Technology	DLTL of School, Career College and Academy Director, CTE Director
Roman, Orlando	Teacher, K-12	Guitar Classroom teacher, member of Instructional Leadership Team, arts Department Chair
Ruggiero, Joe	Teacher, K-12	Economics and AP Macro classroom teacher, member of Instructional Leadership Team, and Social Studies Department Chair
Lubbers, John	Teacher, K-12	ROTC Classroom teacher and director, member of Instructional Leadership Team

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Amaro, Leslie	Teacher, ESE	IEP Facilitator, ESE Department Chair, and member of Instructional Leadership Team
Dawson, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher, AP instructor, Math Department Chair, member of Instructional Leadership Team
Lewitt, Jodi	Dean	Administrative TOA, Safety/Security, Discipline Dean, and Testing Coordinator, Support d=for Science PLCs
McMann, Danielle	Dean	Administrative TOA, Discipline Dean, and Testing Coordinator, Support for Science PLCs

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Karen Chenoweth

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

143

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged



(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626	601	577	487	2291
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	140	118	68	498
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	126	75	43	376

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	81	52	24	258

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	59	51	20	205
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	51	45	16	142

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 8/22/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785	739	614	528	2666
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	117	83	108	443
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5	5	3	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	175	175	155	583
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	294	218	147	105	764

**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	127	152	93	77	449

**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	81	100	72	12	265
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	7	22

**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	0	785	739	614	528	2666
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	117	83	108	443
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5	5	3	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	175	175	155	583
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	294	218	147	105	764

**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	127	152	93	77	449

**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	81	100	72	12	265
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	7	22

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

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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
09	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	51%	50%	1%	53%	-2%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	77%	72%	5%	67%	10%
2018	61%	65%	-4%	65%	-4%
Compare		16%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	72%	63%	9%	70%	2%
2018	68%	63%	5%	68%	0%
Compare		4%			

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
2018	34%	57%	-23%	62%	-28%
Compare		-1%			

  

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%
2018	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
Compare		4%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
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

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	21	43	42	22	44	34	18	35		64	13
ELL	17	47	45	31	61	59	22	37		53	29
ASN	59	54		67							
BLK	32	42	38	35	43	37	57	64		79	33
HSP	46	47	45	42	51	49	58	63		78	42
MUL	62	55		58	64		64	77		83	32
WHT	57	53	52	52	58	48	80	79		77	50
FRL	43	47	43	44	53	47	61	68		72	36

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	58
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	52
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

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

Another area of lowest performance is our graduation rate - we were the lowest in the district. We are looking at data, student engagement in programs, certifications, attendance, SEL, and relationships. We are going to revamp our GradPlan to make it

more effective. We are focusing on our 9th grade teachers and helping students with engagement and creating a sense of belonging for students.

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

Our bottom quartile in both ELA and math had great declines. UHS had a 13% decline in ELA dropping from a 47 to 34 and 10% decline in math from a 47 to a 37. Our English Language Learners had a drastic drop in bottom quartile -10% in ELA and -25% in math. Students with disabilities had a 21% decline in ELA. The performance of these subgroups have a direct impact

on our overall under-performance of our bottom quartile. UHS lost their ESOL director, one of the three ESOL teachers midyear, and three of our ELA co-teachers resulting in substitute teachers delivering instruction. We currently have a full time ESOL director, moved our coach to the be housed with reading and ELA1 for easy access, and our co-taught and support facilitation models are organized in a manner that will provide more support for students. Additionally, all co-teaching positions are filled with qualified educators to begin the academic year.

**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**

Overall percentage of points proves that our SWD had a point spread from 34% to 58% non-SWD within our school for a difference of 24. ELA had a 37 point gap, math 29, and science 47% gap. These are all between our SWD and non-SWD at UHS.

Compared to the district average in 9th grade ELA we were 2 points behind the district and 6% less than the state. UHS lowest quartiles in ELA and math were lower than both the district and the state. Algebra 1 was our greatest gap with 21%

less than the district and 28% lower than the district. Our scores in Algebra 1 were aligned with the previous year. We started implementing data driven PLCs last year and have a very thorough plan in place for this school year as we build upon the foundations laid last year. Additionally, we restructured our layout so all Algebra teachers are located on the same floor creating easy access for daily support and instructional growth within PLCs.

Our newly implemented co-taught model and lack of teacher experience as well as student attendance contribute to overall performance.

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

UHS is very proud of our growth and leading the district in Geometry. Additionally, our science and Social studies students performed above the district and science outperformed the state average by 10%. Our students continue to show learning gains in all core subjects. Science used a very intense remediation program lead by our PLC facilitator to help students achieve mastery and success. Our geometry PLC was standard and data driven and very thorough in analysis to determine student needs and interventions. They used common assessments and collaboration to grow teacher efficacy and increase student achievement.

Additionally, our AP scores increased from 44% to 50% earning a passing score of 3 or better.

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



According to our EWS, major areas of concern are:

\* Attendance below 90% - 443 students with over half of those in 9th and 10th grade.

\*764 students scored a Level 1 on state assessments

\* Referral numbers for freshmen

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

1. SWD performance
2. Graduation Rate - strategy in SEL - relationships, connecting to faculty and staff
3. Acceleration points so all students graduate with certification or credit towards higher education
4. Lowest quartile in ELA and math
- 5.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our SWD are included in our bottom quartile performance. We are focused on the performance of our two lowest sub-groups ESOL and ESE.  
 \*ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains - Our bottom quartile in both ELA and math had significant declines. UHS had a 13% decline in ELA dropping from a 47 to 34 overall. Our English Language Learners had a drop in bottom quartile -10% in ELA and students with disabilities had a 21% decline.  
 \*Math Lowest Quartile learning gains - University High School had a 10% decline in our math bottom quartile from a 47 to a 37 overall. Our English Language Learners had a drastic drop in the lowest quartile -25% in math. Students with disabilities had a 5% decline in math.  
 The performance of these subgroups have a direct impact on our overall under-performance of our bottom quartile.

**Measureable Outcome:** Our ELA goal is to increase from 34% to at least 50% of our students in the lowest quartile making learning gains for the 2020-2021 school year.  
 Our goal is to increase from 37% to 50% of our students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in Math for the 2020-2010 school year

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennie Hughes (jlhughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement and support co-taught model and provide continuous and well planned training, modeling, and coaching for teachers. Additionally using Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to support co-taught teams, use standard based data, instruction strategies to support SWD, administrative support through FOCUS PLCs and data walls. Data walls are used to track bottom quartile, SWD, and ELL performance as well as UHS overall performance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research proves the value of having two professionals share the teaching responsibilities to better meet the needs of students through differentiation, time with students, additional support, and different teaching approaches increases student performance. Research shows that SWD benefited from teachers working together to make the curriculum more accessible to all students.  
 Dufours research is noted for developing strategies to create collaborative teaching environments and increase teacher efficacy. DeFour linked increases in student achievement to schools where there was a shared vision of leadership (administrative support in FOCUS PLCs), where each member of the learning community contributed, and where teachers collectively planned, reflected, and analyzed data to drive instruction and remediation.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create master schedule with common planning for departments, co-taught teams, and PLCs. - Monty Boles
2. Training and implementation start during pre-planning for co-taught models. District specialists are involved in training for ELA teachers for Gen. ED, ESE, and co-taught. Jennie Hughes

3. ILT determines the FOCUS for areas of need for monthly trainings. - Melissa Fraine

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

Data Walls are used to analyze, discuss student progress, share instructional ideas, plan, and reflect. Teachers are trained in 5 models of co-teaching during learning walks, and modeling. Melissa Fraine

5. Administration is in classes weekly for drop-ins, support PLCs weekly, learning walks, and school wide data walks. Coach has a targeted group of co-teachers to give feedback and support. Melissa Fraine

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Graduation rates reflect continuous focus on student success. UHS has a graduation rate of 82% which shows a 4% increase from last year but is currently the lowest high school graduation rate in the district.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	Increase graduation rate by 8% for the 2020 - 2021 school year. This would put us at 90%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>University will focus on engaging all students in programs where we can instill a sense of belonging, build relationships, and earn certifications.</p> <p>Based on research by MDRC, specific programs were developed with the aim of restructuring large high schools into small learning communities and creating better pathways from high school to further education and the workplace. This study tracked a sample of students for 12 years and found strong and sustained impacts on their labor market outcomes. Research proved the model promoted increased attendance, student engagement, student success, and increased graduation rate. ACTE research shows that taking one CTE class for every two academic classes minimizes the risk of students dropping out of school. The average high school graduation rate for students concentrating in programs is 93 percent, compared to an average national graduation rate of 80 percent.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create a 9th grade teacher group to brain-storm ways to engage freshmen students immediately and create a sense of belonging. The focus is building relationships and helping students engage. First meeting is during pre-planning. Mrs. Chenoweth
2. CTE director is pulling names of every student who hasn't earned certification - scheduling students, based on interest, into the appropriate classes to provide opportunities. Jennifer Peel
3. Programs such as AVID, Cambridge, ROTC, Culinary, Finance, Robotics, Engineering, Bio-Med, Agriscience, Arts, AP, Multi-Digital, Criminal Justice, OJT/DCT, Game & Si are small learning communities for students. We provide 25 programs across campus. Teachers help guide students to make connections. Jennifer Peel
4. GradPlan helps students take ownership for their progress towards graduation - Teacher training monthly - a clear path of understanding and accountability for students as they navigate through high school. Teachers work with their 4th period students to monitor progress. Monty Boles

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Peel (jmpeel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additionally, CTE director is making sure all CTE instructors get the appropriate training and testing to become certified in order to test students. The expectation is all students in CTE programs will test for certification.

Also, guidance is scheduling students into accelerated classes.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Researchers have documented the importance of caring teacher-student and student-student relationships in fostering students' commitment to school and in promoting academic success. Safe and orderly environments that encourage and reinforce positive classroom behavior have been identified by research as one of the necessary conditions for academic achievement (Marzano, 2003). Therefore, we are focusing on changing our discipline environment to more of a restorative practice rather than strictly punitive. This focus is a mindset change that the ILT determined would lead to a positive change.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>According to our EWS, 9th grade students had the highest number of referrals and absenteeism. Additionally, feedback from some teachers reported the morale was low in relation to student discipline and change in behavior. Our goal is to train teachers to implement SEL in their practices, share SEL strategies/ focus during ISS, and document a more positive environment for students and teachers. Our goal is to see referrals drop by 20%.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>A meta-analysis of 213 programs, primarily covering three decades of research, found that social and emotional learning interventions increased students' academic performance by 11 percentile points, as compared to students who did not participate in such SEL programs (Durlak et al., 2011). The social and emotional learning programs also reduced aggression and emotional distress among students, increased helping behaviors in school, and improved positive attitudes toward self and others (Durlak et al., 2011). Effective SEL programs addressed the five key competencies, explicitly and sequentially, and used active-learning techniques to engage youth in developing understanding of them.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Relationships and emotional processes affect how and what we learn. By reducing misbehavior and the amount of time spent on classroom management, SEL programs create more time for teaching and learning. SEL also strengthens students' relationships with their peers, families, and teachers, who are mediators, collaborators, and encouragers of academic achievement.</p>

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Our ISS is being transformed into a productive academic and SEL training room. The ISS teacher is receiving district training. Students will engage in SEL lessons or strategies. - Ben Carter
2. Teachers will receive monthly training to implement SEL/restorative practices and build relationship in their classrooms. Ben Carter
3. We will monitor referral numbers and categories each quarter. Additionally, teacher feedback will help determine needs. - Kerry Cunningham
3. SEL will be added to PLC minutes to encourage teacher collaboration and discussion. Melissa Fraine

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

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Acceleration Rate - tracking and monitoring student placement and success**

## 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.

Culture & Climate of School:

SAC - community involvement and support - all stakeholders

Sunshine Committee - creating positive atmosphere and activities for teachers

Creed program - recognizing teachers and students

AVID - community and parent involvement

SEL - campus wide

Recognizing Attendance and academic success for students and teachers

CTE programs involving community and business partners

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.