Sebastian River High School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sebastian River High School

9001 90TH AVE, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Dariyall Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Indian River 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

Sebastian River High School will lead the state of Florida in educational innovation and real-world preparation of our diverse population, so that each student achieves his/her highest potential and becomes a contributing member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement

School vision statement :Encouraging Innovation, Promoting Excellence

We envision a climate of high expectations for student success, where every teacher, parent and student is clear on the knowledge, skills and dispositions students are expected to acquire in each course, grade level and unit of instruction. A collaborative culture that ensures staff members work together interdependently to better meet the needs of their students and to analyze and improve their professional practice. A safe and orderly environment

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Dariyall	Principal	1. Coordinate and provide leadership in the Schools Improvement process, implementation of the School improvement plan and of the School Advisory Council. 2. Establish a vision, build teams to accomplish plans, goals and priorities of SRHS. 3. Promote and market SRHS and its priorities.
Contri, Jackie	Assistant Principal	1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities.
VanBrimmer, Kevin	Assistant Principal	1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities.
Ward, Kelly	Assistant Principal	1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities.
Wilson, Billy	Assistant Principal	1. Provide leadership with the planning and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. 2. Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement, summer school, before and after school programs. 3. Assist with positive school climate, and school attendance 4. Assist in the coordination of staff development, facilitate personnel, and Assist with a positive school climate. 5. Assist in promoting and marketing the school and its priorities.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kramer, Lois	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.
Truesdale, Branda	Teacher, ESE	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.
Daniel, Karyn	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.
DeAmara, James	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.
Acosta, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.
Brown, Jody	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.
Valencia, Enrique	Guidance Counselor	1. To Provide administrative support in the creation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Pinkney, Elizebeth	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Arce, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair 1. To be an integral part of working collaboratively with their department to identify barriers, establish goals and an action plan for improvement of their subject area to be included in the School Improvement Plan.

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	583	480	457	380	1900
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	82	103	98	413
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	36	28	16	142
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	170	163	83	611
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	170	163	83	611

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	167	126	124	78	495

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	67	0	0	0	67
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	16	8	44

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
102

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 7/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	46%	58%	56%	47%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	54%	51%	50%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	40%	42%	38%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	36%	48%	51%	48%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	40%	46%	48%	53%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	39%	45%	39%	36%	45%
Science Achievement	59%	68%	68%	59%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	47%	68%	73%	56%	73%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	583 (0)	480 (0)	457 (0)	380 (0)	1900 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	130 ()	82 ()	103 ()	98 ()	413 (0)
One or more suspensions	62 (0)	36 (0)	28 (0)	16 (0)	142 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	195 (0)	170 (0)	163 (0)	83 (0)	611 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	195 (0)	170 (0)	163 (0)	83 (0)	611 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	47%	51%	-4%	53%	-6%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	58%	64%	-6%	67%	-9%
2018	58%	61%	-3%	65%	-7%
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	45%	64%	-19%	70%	-25%
2018	56%	70%	-14%	68%	-12%
Compare		-11%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	58%	-29%	61%	-32%
2018	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	53%	-12%	57%	-16%
2018	55%	50%	5%	56%	-1%
Compare		-14%			

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	34	27	14	31	30	30	38		88	16
ELL	14	23	19	13	29	23	22	6		82	
ASN	69	50									
BLK	43	46	26	26	39	46	53	33		80	36
HSP	38	44	27	30	39	24	55	42		87	63
MUL	36	52		29	38		40				
WHT	52	53	46	43	41	27	64	54		96	64
FRL	36	42	26	31	38	30	51	45		89	56

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	37	37	29	35	25	37	21		70	35
ELL	8	47	43								
ASN	70	50									
BLK	35	48	42	28	32	29	38	44		70	43

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
HSP	39	47	34	41	48	34	51	51		85	67
MUL	30	30		58			50			61	73
WHT	53	53	42	56	61	45	66	63		87	74
FRL	38	47	41	42	54	36	51	52		80	66

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	54
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	45
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

Lowest quartile gains in Math (29%) and ELA (33%). In math, teachers identified a mis-alignment of the curriculum map and standards. Additionally, as some Algebra teachers were teaching a single-year Algebra I course and others were teaching Algebra 1-B, collaboration and team planning was not seen as feasible. The results indicate a lack of instructional quality across our classrooms. In ELA, collaborative planning was not common place, so instructional integrity and quality was not the same across our classrooms.

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

Mathematics gains declined the most from our prior year. In 2017-2018, 53% and 40% in 2018-19. Teachers identified mis-alignment of curriculum maps and standards, collaboration and team planning was not feasible and lack of instructional quality.

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

The US History Exam showed the greatest decline from the prior year. SRHS ranked at 56% in comparison to the state average which was 71%. The contributing factors to this decline was based on the lack of collaborative planning for all US History teachers. Data analysis of test item specs did not improve scores based on student performance in weaker areas related to the standards. Instructional reading strategies/trainings were not acquired in a timely manner to make a difference in low level readers, who struggled with comprehension and acquisition of knowledge as it pertains to the course content, which was evident in student's test scores.

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

Sebastian River High School's graduation rate increased from 84% to 91%. The new action taken to improve our graduation rate was our ability to enroll students in our credit retrieval program during the school day. Additionally, Sebastian River High School also offered credit retrieval during summer school to all seniors who were lacking required credits. Sebastian River High School's Graduation coach was also a primary reason why our graduation rate significantly increased last year. The Graduation Coach was able to meet with those seniors and juniors who were at risk of not meeting the graduation requirements and was able to monitor each student's progress and advise them on a continuous basis.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

According to Early Warning System the potential areas of concern are as follows: 2019 FSA Reading and Math Level 1 students.

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

1. Professional development for instructional improvement – Strategic Instructional Models (SIMS)
2. Increased teacher collaboration in planning for FSA/EOC courses
3. Performance of our lowest 25% students in Math and ELA

4. Full implementation of Achieve 3000 for 9th and 10th grade reading students
5. Additional help and support for ELL and ESE students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Professional development for instructional improvement – SIMs
Rationale	SRHS is partnering with Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS) to bring the Strategic Instructional Model (SIM) to our teachers through a year-long professional development series. Dr. Martha McAdams and colleagues will be providing PD on a bi-monthly basis on two high-yield instructional strategies for content enhancement – FRAME Routine and Instructional Planning for Units Routine -- that makes big idea concepts more clear and accessible for all students.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers will include the use of these instructional strategies in their lesson plans and implement them in the classrooms with their students. Research from the University of Kansas has shown the students utilizing content enhancement strategies gain on average of 10-20 percentage points on tests that require students to demonstrate learning. As we are implementing these in stages this year, our measurable outcome we plan to achieve is a 5-10 percent increase in our Math achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25% learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of the Strategic Instructional Model has been shown to increase student scores on tests by 10-20 percentage points through research conducted by the University of Kansas. Specifically, teachers will be trained in the implementation of the FRAME Routine for organizing information under larger ideas, then main ideas, then essential details, ultimately leading to why the information is important. This will allow students to identify critical content and prompt them to elaborate on those points. Teachers will also be trained on using planning routines for units of study.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Math achievement for SRHS for the 18-19 school year was 36%, our learning gains were 40%, and our Lowest 25% gains were at 29%. These were the lowest achievement levels in each category, and fell well below the state averages of 51%, 48%, and 45%, respectively. These results are evidence of a disconnect between the math skills students must demonstrate and what they are learning. The SIM -- and specifically the use of FRAMES -- is geared toward organizing information and learning in a clear way for students to understand and retain the information and skills.

Action Step	
Description	1. Dr. McAdams and FDLRS personnel will plan effective professional development sessions. 2. Dr. McAdams and FDLRS personnel will provide bi-monthly PD sessions on school-based PD early release days. 3. Teachers will include the use of the SIM routines and strategies in their lesson planning and implement FRAME Routine in their classes. 4. Administrators will review lesson plans to ensure FRAMEs are planned for, and will monitor for implementation through Classroom Walk Throughs.

Person Responsible   Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increased teacher collaboration in planning for FSA/EOC courses
Rationale	At Sebastian River High School, 40% of the Students had success in Math Gains while 60% did not. Our Mathematics lowest 25% students only saw a 29% success rate. Teachers believe that lack of planning, instructional support and mis-alignment of pacing guide contributed to their lack of success.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	It is the goal of Sebastian River High School to improve their Mathematics gains by 14% from 40% to 54% to increase the Mathematics Lowest 25% from 29% to 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	According to Educational Leadership, as teachers collaborate, they are benefiting by increasing their opportunities to interact with one another on areas that affect teacher growth and development, organizational and professional commitment as well as school quality and student performance. Ken Futernick (2007) states that, after surveying 2,000 current and former teachers in California, their self-efficacy had improved as they took part in decision making, and established strong collegial relationships creating for an environment of trust and higher expectations for themselves and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As delineated by teachers, not having enough time to collaborate with peers was a concern and attributed to low test scores. Teacher's self-efficacy was low and so were student scores. Providing teachers with time to collaborate on strategies, expectations, proper use of pacing guide/lesson plans that reflect our diverse students in need is necessary to address our Low Math Gains for our Multicultural, our Students with Disabilities and our ELL students and those in the lowest 25% as well. Teacher collaboration are to be reflected in lesson plan tooling and data chats, which will be uploaded and saved into Canvas and verified by the SRHS administration team on a weekly basis with fidelity. Administrators will provide the necessary feedback to teachers, which is essential to instructional coaching for quality assurance.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers and administration will plan collaboratively by department every week throughout the year. 2. Teachers and administration will participate in data chats after every unit assessment throughout the year. 3. Teachers will participate in providing administration with lesson plans on Canvas that include all components as they relate to pacing guide, standards, accommodations and how they will impact our students in need throughout the year.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Increasing performance of our lowest 25% students in Math and ELA
Rationale	Our lowest quartile students are out most in need of additional support to be successful. Their learning gains were the lowest performing component of our school grade in 2018-2019. In order to close the achievement gap of our students in the lowest 25%, many of which are ELL, ESE, and multiracial students performing below 41% on state assessments, we must focus our energies into boosting their performance.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	SRHS expects the learning gains of our lowest 25% students to increase by a minimum of 10% in math and 10% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	SRHS will implement the use of FRAME Routines to assist students in organizing information in big ideas, main ideas, and essential details. This strategy has been shown, in research by the University of Kansas, to increase student performance on tests by 10-20%. In our reading classes we are fully implementing the use of Achieve 3000 as the curriculum. Achieve 3000, in a nationwide study during the 2017-2018 school year, doubled the reading gains in lexile level of students who used the program as opposed to students who did not utilize the program. Further, SRHS will be providing afterschool tutoring, free of charge, four hours a week (two hours each on Tuesday and Thursday) throughout the year. While tutoring is open to all students, teachers encourage our ESE, ELL, multiracial, and bottom quartile students to attend. Our ELL specialist will provide a tutoring room specifically to assist those students. Our ELL specialist will also provide monthly PD opportunities after school for teachers in high-yield strategies to reach limited-English students and appropriated modifications and accommodations. Our ESE support facilitation teachers will put together a "toolbox" for teachers in all subject areas that can be used to help ESE students succeed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The approach we took previously to boosting these students was ineffective. With a more focused approach to these students, utilizing strategies that are proven through research to increase student achievement for struggling students, we believe we will see a marked improvement and level of success for these students.
Action Step	
Description	1. All teachers identified the students in their classes that are in the lowest 25%. 2. After each unit assessment in the state-tested courses, teachers will disagregate the data for each class period, drilling down not just to the lowest quartile students, but also within each subgroup – including race/ethnicity, SWD, and ELL. 3. Before meeting with their administrator for a data chat, teachers will

reflect on the data and identify areas of weakness and write a plan of action for remediation in those areas.
4. ELA Lowest 25% Students are receiving instruction through Achieve 3000 daily through reading class.
5. Tutoring has started two days a week and teachers are encouraging those bottom quartile students to attend, as well as all ELL and ESE students.
6. ELL specialist will design and schedule monthly PDs for teachers on supporting ELL students.

4.
5.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

N/A

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Professional development for instructional improvement – SIMs					$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6000	970-To Internal Service Funds	0291 - Sebastian River High School	General Fund	110.0	$1,500.00	
			Notes: FDLRS (Consultation fee)				
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increased teacher collaboration in planning for FSA/EOC courses					$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increasing performance of our lowest 25% students in Math and ELA					$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	3354	651-Bus(es)	0291 - Sebastian River High School	General Fund	1.0	$0.00	
			Notes: SAC Approved Transportation				
						Total:	$1,500.00