

Volusia County Schools

New Smyrna Beach Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

New Smyrna Beach Middle School

1200 S MYRTLE AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/newsmyrnabeach/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Porter

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	97%
2018-19 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 (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	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 Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

New Smyrna Beach Middle School

1200 S MYRTLE AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/newsmyrnabeach/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at New Smyrna Beach Middle School is to provide a safe environment which promotes respect and motivates students to learn, achieve, and act responsibly in order to achieve their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe education is the shared responsibility of the student, home, school, and community.

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
Leader, Michael	Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all instructional staff, supervising all support staff, implementation of instructional practices, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, assign School Leadership Team, coordinate meetings of School Leadership Team, engage with all stakeholders, and final approval of School Improvement Plan.
Carey, Amy	Assistant Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all new instructional staff, supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all 6th grade stakeholders.
Farajallah, Sabra	Assistant Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, implementation of professional development, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all 8th grade stakeholders.
Hammond, Jana	Dean	The jobs duties include supervising all Social Emotional Learning instruction, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all 7th grade stakeholders.
Butrico, Kristin	Assistant Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all ESE instructional staff, supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all ESE related stakeholders.
Bellantoni, Ann	Instructional Coach	The jobs duties include supervising all instructional staff during PLC time, supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in ELA curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in ELA, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, provide professional development in ELA instruction, and engage with all stakeholders.
Hughes, Gabriele	Instructional Coach	The jobs duties include supervising all instructional staff during PLC time, supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in math curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in math, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, provide professional development in math instruction, and engage with all stakeholders.

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	396	407	412	0	0	0	0	1215	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	38	33	0	0	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	10	2	0	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	142	125	0	0	0	0	375	

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	34	30	25	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

77

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	52	49	71	0	0	0	0	172	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	43	36	0	0	0	0	129	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	24	41	0	0	0	0	102	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	42	56	0	0	0	0	146	

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	57	48	56	0	0	0	0	161	

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	50%	51%	54%	52%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	54%	52%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	42%	47%	37%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	54%	58%	52%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	44%	51%	57%	50%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	51%	47%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	58%	51%	59%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	71%	72%	75%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	396 (0)	407 (0)	412 (0)	1215 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	25 ()	38 ()	33 ()	96 (0)
One or more suspensions	9 (0)	8 (0)	10 (0)	27 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	29 (0)	10 (0)	2 (0)	41 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	108 (0)	142 (0)	125 (0)	375 (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
06	2019	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	47%	1%	52%	-4%
	2018	45%	47%	-2%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	48%	0%	55%	-7%
	2018	52%	49%	3%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
	2018	34%	44%	-10%	54%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	24%	29%	-5%	46%	-22%
	2018	37%	37%	0%	45%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	57%	4%	48%	13%
	2018	64%	60%	4%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	68%	4%	71%	1%
2018	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	54%	23%	61%	16%
2018	87%	57%	30%	62%	25%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	55%	28%	57%	26%
2018	84%	55%	29%	56%	28%
Compare		-1%			

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	18	34	34	18	35	29	33	32	46		
ASN	70	70		90	40						
BLK	24	34	30	22	39	35	33	60			
HSP	60	51	42	58	48	60	83	72	71		
MUL	43	54	59	30	31	29	52	50	60		
WHT	53	48	35	55	45	39	65	75	76		
FRL	41	43	34	41	42	39	55	64	68		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	38	30	18	39	35	29	46	62		
ASN	70			80							
BLK	23	39	33	31	41	39	38	56			
HSP	49	35	25	53	46	46	69	73	88		
MUL	43	48	39	50	51	36	54	76	70		
WHT	54	47	37	56	56	44	68	75	78		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	42	42	33	44	48	37	59	68	68		
2017 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	14	32	33	19	42	44	18	39			
ASN	69	62		83	75						
BLK	17	30	26	26	32	30	22	64	69		
HSP	54	58	82	53	49	20	63	87	62		
MUL	48	44	25	37	51	71	50	73			
WHT	56	54	37	55	51	51	63	76	83		
FRL	43	48	37	43	46	46	48	67	75		

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	53
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 performance component is 8th grade math as the score moved from 37% to 24% which was negative 13%. Contributing factors teacher turn over, class is all lower quartile students and students with disabilities. Another, lower performance component is Algebra 1 as the score moved from 86% to 78% which is negative 8%. Contributing factors could be not using ALEK system in the classroom, teacher use of resources, and teacher knowledge of standards in the FSA.

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

Lowest performance component is 8th grade math as the score moved from 37% to 24% which was negative 13%. Contributing factors of teacher turn over, class is all lower quartile students and students with disabilities.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was the 8th grade math where the state score was 46% and our school obtained a 24% which is a difference of 22%. Contributing factors of teacher turn over, class is all lower quartile students and students with disabilities.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 7th grade math which moved from 34% to 46% which is an increase in 12%. Contributing factors were classroom management, engaging lessons, coach support, teacher willingness to try new strategies, in class remediation, and student-based learning.

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

Early Warning System Data shows 89 students with two or more indicators. School wide 96 students were below 90% attendance. School wide 375 students scored 1 on a state wide assessment.

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

1. 8th Grade Math
2. Algebra 1
3. Geometry
4. 8th grade ELA
5. reducing referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest quartile
Rationale	The results of our needs analysis and assessment revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 50%, ELA learning gains was at 48%, and the lowest quartile performed at 36%. The School Leadership Team believes that in supporting and focusing on the lower quartile there will be an improvement in proficiency in ELA for all students. The lowest quartile students also included our two targeted ESSSA subgroups of students with disabilities and African American students. Students with disabilities data revealed ELA proficiency was at 18%, ELA learning gains was at 34% and the lowest quartile performed at 34%. Students with disabilities in eight grade ELA 14% passed FSA with a 3 or better. African American students' data revealed ELA proficiency was at 24%, ELA learning gains was at 34% and the lowest quartile performed at 30%. African American students in eight grade ELA 28% passed FSA with a 3 or better.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the ELA lowest quartile from 36% to 54%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented is standards-based instruction through all stakeholders of the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in ELA. John Hattie's effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .75, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers is .72, and learning goals vs no learning goals .68. Research on standards-based instruction has been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IPG tools training during ERPL 2. ESE subgroup and diversity training to aid in differentiation of standards-based activities 3. Common planning time for all ELA teachers 4. More ESE collaboration time together with general education ELA teachers 5. PLC meetings weekly for all ELA teachers to collaborate with meeting minutes 6. Lesson standards posted in every classroom for students' reference 7. Standards-based ELA resources 8. ELA standards-based data chats in PLC time including student subcategories broken down for more specific data drive analyzing 9. ELA instructional coaching available 10. Standards-based remediation plan for each grade level PLC which will be given to administration 11. Administrative walk throughs

- 12. Learning walks with staff and district personnel in ESE and curriculum areas
- 13. Collective efficacy book study

Person Responsible Michael Leader (mkleader@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Lowest quartile
Rationale	The results of our needs analysis and assessment revealed that our math proficiency was at 51%, math learning gains was at 44% and the lowest quartile performed at 39%. The School Leadership Team believes that in supporting and focusing on the lower quartile there will be an improvement in proficiency in math for all students. The lowest quartile students also included our two targeted ESSSA subgroups of students with disabilities and African American Students. Students with disabilities data revealed math proficiency was at 18%, math learning gains was at 35% and the lowest quartile performed at 29%. Students with disabilities in eight grade math 12% passed FSA with a 3 or better. African American students' data revealed math proficiency was at 22%, math learning gains was at 39% and the lowest quartile performed at 35%. African American students in eight grade math 4% passed FSA with a 3 or better.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the math lowest quartile from 39% to 54%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Leader (mkleader@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented is standards-based instruction through all stakeholders of the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in math. John Hattie's effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .75, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers is .72, and learning goals vs no learning goals .68. Research on standards-based instruction have been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IPG tools training during ERPL 2. ESE subgroup and diversity training to aid in differentiation of standards-based activities 3. Common planning time for all Math teachers 4. More ESE collaboration time together with general education Math teachers 5. PLC meetings weekly for all Math teachers to collaborate with meeting minutes 6. Lesson standards posted in every classroom for students' reference 7. Standards-based math resources 8. Math standards-based data chats in PLC time including student subcategories broken down for more specific data drive analyzing 9. Math instructional coaching available 10. Standards-based remediation plan for each grade level PLC which will be given to administration 11. Administrative walk throughs

12. Learning walks with staff and district personnel in ESE and curriculum areas
13. Collective efficacy book study

Person Responsible Michael Leader (mkleader@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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).

One main school wide improvement priority goal is to reduce the number of discipline referrals given to students. The goal is to get the number of discipline referrals to be at no more than 2074 referrals for the 2019-2020 school year. This school wide goal will be met using strategies such as restorative practices eye for an eye training, social emotional learning lessons for students and teachers, homeroom time with Social Emotional Learning lessons, teacher training and book study on proper use of classroom reinforcements, and teacher training on classroom circle time from Restorative Practices. Another school wide improvement priority is to involve all stakeholders in positive interactions of students and stakeholders throughout the school campus and in the community. The community and community business partners will be involved in collecting prizes and outreach for the positive referral parties to reward student for positive actions. Students who receive positive referrals will be invited to a positive referral party where they will receive prizes and interact with the local community to showcase and reward their positive behaviors on the school campus.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest quartile	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00