

Volusia County Schools

David C. Hinson Sr. 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	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: William Dunnigan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2019

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)	93%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (65%)
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	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>57%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>39%</p>

School Grades History

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

Mission- Through individual commitment of our entire learning community, David C. Hinson Middle School will provide a rich and rigorous environment that fosters high academic achievement and citizenship for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision- We believe that an orderly and safe campus promotes an optimum learning environment by encouraging and supporting citizenship.

We believe that all our children will be successful in high school and become responsible and contributing members of society.

We believe in a well-balanced, comprehensive, and success-oriented curriculum that responds to the physical, intellectual, social, and emotional needs of our students.

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
Dunnigan, William	Principal	Oversees administrative staff and acts as instructional leader for David C. Hinson Middle school. Facilitates management of resources (human and other) as well as facilities management and operations of the school on a daily basis.
Fulcher, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Conducts discipline for 8th grade class, oversees 8th grade guidance, zone variance, 8th grade lunch supervision, gifted/504 8th grade students, curriculum/data coordinator/program of studies, SIP/SAC administrator, and testing coordinator for the school.
Sierra, Ida	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair, SAC Committee chair will run the SAC meetings and interact with persons in the community. Review data on campus and conducting the school climate survey.
Dickens, Ronnie	Assistant Principal	Discipline for 6th grade, oversees 6th grade guidance, 6th grade lunch supervision, facilities maintenance overseer, 6th grade orientation, step up coordinator, gifted/504 grade 6, and staff supplements on campus.
Stevenson, Delecia	Assistant Principal	Discipline for ESE grades 6-8, guidance grade 7, zone variances ESE grades 6-8, 7th grade lunch supervision, gifted/504 grade 7 students, ESE coordinator, blood borne pathogens/Right To Know, Transportation contact, summer school coordinator, faculty meeting coordinator, substitutes, new teacher contact, staff/student recognition/marquee, ESE Teacher/electives evaluations, and 504 contact.
Vetter, Joe	Teacher, K-12	
Manis, Nita	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Nottingham, Dena	Teacher, K-12	Reading Department Chair
Phelps, Mindi	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Prather, David	Teacher, K-12	Electives Department Chair
Iorio, Greg	Dean	Discipline

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	355	331	326	0	0	0	0	1012
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	30	28	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	46	41	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	4	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	86	85	0	0	0	0	247

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	47	43	29	0	0	0	0	119

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11

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

61

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/20/2019

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	23	27	21	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	29	20	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	42	40	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	45	37	0	0	0	0	110

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	40	59	51	0	0	0	0	150

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	52%	51%	54%	52%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	54%	52%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	47%	35%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	54%	58%	61%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	54%	51%	57%	55%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	51%	35%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	58%	51%	67%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	71%	72%	70%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	355 (0)	331 (0)	326 (0)	1012 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 ()	30 ()	28 ()	91 (0)
One or more suspensions	68 (0)	46 (0)	41 (0)	155 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	24 (0)	21 (0)	4 (0)	49 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	76 (0)	86 (0)	85 (0)	247 (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	53%	50%	3%	54%	-1%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	47%	5%	52%	0%
	2018	53%	47%	6%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	57%	48%	9%	55%	2%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	47%	14%	54%	7%
	2018	57%	44%	13%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	39%	29%	10%	46%	-7%
	2018	44%	37%	7%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	62%	57%	5%	48%	14%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	50%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	77%	68%	9%	71%	6%
2018	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
Compare		5%			
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	90%	54%	36%	61%	29%
2018	95%	57%	38%	62%	33%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	55%	36%	57%	34%
2018	100%	55%	45%	56%	44%
Compare		-9%			

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	19	42	43	31	46	40	22	50			
ELL	42	65	54	63	61		33				
ASN	78	65		89	66		89	76	83		
BLK	35	46	47	44	50	42	41	70	65		
HSP	39	49	57	44	52	40	36	83			
MUL	45	50	53	60	57	65	57	75	90		
WHT	57	53	47	69	54	49	72	83	77		
FRL	39	48	47	53	51	45	51	75	64		
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	25	44	42	29	47	49	38	42			
ELL	30	38	27	53	48						
ASN	76	70	42	88	70		84	82	93		
BLK	41	49	43	44	54	46	47	60	78		
HSP	56	58	47	57	57	59	53	54	100		

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
MUL	49	48	31	55	55	47	77	69	82		
WHT	63	58	49	71	61	55	77	81	85		
FRL	46	51	44	54	56	48	55	65	79		
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	9	31	33	11	34	33	18	18			
ELL	15	29	30	44	44						
ASN	77	69		90	76		92	76	100		
BLK	34	41	37	41	44	34	40	56	73		
HSP	42	51	36	49	50	38	62	74	60		
MUL	53	45	20	60	50	29	64	80	67		
WHT	58	56	36	67	58	36	72	75	76		
FRL	37	43	34	46	46	35	53	55	61		

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	78
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	61
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	62
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	54
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.

The sixth grade ELA scores were compared to the state and found to be the lowest performing subject area as the state achievement level was 1% higher than David C. Hinson students. Sixth grade students performed at 51% proficiency and the state overall achievement performed at 52%. Contributing factors were chronic absences, retention, high amount of ESE/SWD.

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

Student achievement declines from the prior year is as follows: 8th grade ELA by 16 points, 8th grade math and algebra by 5 points and geometry by 9 points. Factors that contributed to the decreases student achievement were change in district assessment policies and platform for math and overall inconsistent instructional standards and collaborative practices.

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.

SWD and 6 grade ELA were 1 percentage point below the state, 8th grade was 6 percentage points below and 8th grade math was 7 percentage points below the state. Factors that contributed to the decreases student achievement were change in district assessment policies and platform for math and overall inconsistent instructional standards and collaborative practices.

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

Data components that showed most improvement were Civics EOC with an overall gain of 5 points and 7th grade math with an increase of 4 percentage points from the previous year.

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

Two areas of potential concern have been identified. The upcoming 8th grade class has high levels of attendance issues and the upcoming 7th grade has the highest amount of student failure rate in ELA or Math.

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

1. Inclusion practices for students with disabilities
2. Increase Florida State Assessment overall achievement levels in ELA and Math, with a focus on

the lowest quartile.

3. Increase knowledge of how to integrate the depth of Florida Standards instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	According to NCBI, individualized interventions for students with disabilities help differentiate core instruction for struggling students in a timely manner. Additionally, state data indicates they are our lowest performing subgroup. The school's SWD subgroup fell below 41% (State standard is above 41%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase students with disabilities proficiency from 37% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Inclusive practices for SWD to include ESE/Core teachers collaboration to promote best inclusive instructional practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The intent of implementing the strategies above is to increase teacher knowledge in inclusive instructional practices for SWD, which will positively affect SWD achievement levels. Findings from The Institute of Education Sciences (ERIC) establishes that Inclusive Lecture Strategies has an effect size of .67 and understanding accommodations for inclusiveness an effect size .64.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present to staff school data reflecting the need for focus in this area. (Principal) 2. Provide Professional Development from District Specialist on inclusive best practice for SWD. Rotations in these areas; technology usage for differentiation; ESE/Core teachers collaborative practice for planning instruction; and inclusive instructional practice that reflects focus on IEP's (ESE District Specialist). 3. Professional Learning Communities will review and analyze data on a monthly basis. (Administration and Teachers) 4. Learning walks for teachers and walk-throughs by administration. (Administration, Instructional Coach, and Teachers)
Person Responsible	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our needs assessment and analysis has revealed that the school's ELA Proficiency were at 52%, ELA Learning Gains at 52% and the Lowest Quartile at 47% which was 2% below the state average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA levels as follows: - Overall achievement from 52% to 58% - Learning gains from 54% to 60% - Lowest quartile from 47% to 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FI Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE, and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PD on SWD/inclusive instructional practices. 3. Administer the district diagnostic to establish baseline data. 4. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, ELL, and Intervention Teachers to review data and collaborative plan instruction to ensure best support services. 5. Conduct weekly PLC's for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions. 6. Establishment of New Teacher Support Program. 7. Monitor inclusive instructional practices through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and feedback.
Person Responsible	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our needs assessment and analysis for the year revealed that the school's math achievement level at 63% was 2% below the previous year, math learning gains at 54%, 6% below the previous year, and the lowest quartile of students scored at 47%, 6% below the previous year. Showing that the lowest quartile of students has most opportunity for growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math levels as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall achievement goal from 63% to 68% - Learning gains from 54% to 57% - Lowest quartile from 47% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led small group instruction by implementing a blended learning rotation including direct instruction, technology based instruction and assessments, project based learning/ activities and interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to John Hattie's findings in his meta-analysis, Visible Learning, small group instruction has an effect size of .49, direct instruction .59, project based learning 1.28, response to intervention 1.29 and technology in math .59.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review lowest quartile data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE, and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PD on intervention practices and blended learning. 3. Administer the SMT diagnostic to establish baseline data. 4. Conduct weekly PLCs, progress monitoring meetings with ESE, ELL and intervention teachers to review data, and collaboratively plan instruction to ensure best intervention/ support practices and blended learning strategies. 5. Monitor inclusive instructional practices through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and feedback.
Person Responsible	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@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).

Establishment of New Teacher Support Program.

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.

Mr. Iorio, Dean of Student Relations, develops community partnerships to further student participation in the community. National Junior Honor Society and the Student Government Association volunteer in the community to increase positive awareness of the school. Stakeholders are invited to be a part of the Parent Teacher Association, School Advisory Council, and to Volunteer on campus.

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.

The school employs a Social Emotional Learning Curriculum and teacher/counselor, Toni Holland. She provides lesson plans for teachers and team teaches with them when time permits. Mrs. Holland conducts small groups and individual, short term counseling for students. Mr. Iorio, Dean of Student Relations, has provided training to all faculty for Restorative Justice and employs this in relation to disciplinary issues on campus.

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

The school works with feeder elementary schools to assist the incoming sixth graders with registration and becoming familiar with middle school requirements. Each spring parents of in-coming 6th graders are invited to an orientation to become familiar with familiar with the school. Prior to the beginning of the school year, the guidance department offers a program called Step Up to welcome sixth graders to review expectations, dress code, and to tour the campus.

The eighth graders are invited to the high school showcase to learn about the various programs the high schools offer. The school will advertise the high school orientation schedule. Students meet with representatives of the different high schools to discuss their high school courses.

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.

The school-based leadership team assesses and identifies school needs and resources (both materials and personnel) through data analysis. Areas of focus are prioritized and a school improvement plan built, which includes academic and behavioral support that aligns to needs and resources. Strength and specializations are considered to assign functions to teams such as the Problem Solving Team, Behavior Leadership Team and Professional Learning Communities. Funds, services and program are also distributed according to the areas of focus and the overall school improvement plan. The Problem Solving process (problem identification, analysis of problem, intervention implementation and response to intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams. Adherence of the to the Problem Solving process

ensures that individual, class-wide and school-wide issues are addressed systematically to ensure allocation of resources and personnel have the highest impact on student achievement.

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

The school offers students electives courses in art, criminal justice, STEM, digital literacy, critical thinking, music, business, and culinary. Many of these courses focus on job skills and help to develop a work ethic which is necessary to successful future employment. Each year, students and parents participate in a course selection that exposes them to next year's curriculum to assist with course selection. Students have the option to participate in a CHOICES program. Sixth grade will focus on learning styles and interest inventories. Seventh grade will use the interest inventory to identify career clusters. Eighth grade will use the career cluster and develop a four year educational plan. Students will also be invited to the high school showcase to help with academic planning. Students in 7th grade attend a STEM day with Embry Riddle University to encourage science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.