# Silver Sands Middle School

# 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Silver Sands Middle School

## 1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

### http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/silversandsmiddle/pages/default.aspx

**Demographics**

## Principal: Rick Inge

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **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** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 99% |
| **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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: A (62%) |
| **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

# Silver Sands Middle School

## 1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

## http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/silversandsmiddle/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 | 61% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 29% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Silver Sands is committed to building individual character and achievement by linking learning to life through real world applications.

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

Silver Sands Middle School follows the vision statement of Volusia County Schools. Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Wiles, Amanda | Principal | Oversee professional development and monitoring of data |
| Carignan, Tim | Dean | Discipline |
| Lecras, Timothy | Teacher, K-12 | 7th Grade Social Studies |
| Jones, Jessica | Instructional Media | Development of School Improvement Plan |
| Mitchell, LaTonya | Assistant Principal | Overseeing professional development and monitoring of data |
| Leathead, Todd | Assistant Principal | Overseeing professional development and monitoring of data |

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499 | 426 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1344 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 69 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 104 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 |

**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 | 41 | 37 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

**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 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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)**
76

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Friday 8/16/2019

### 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 | 74 | 54 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 79 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 104 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 |

**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 | 65 | 57 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 |

## 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 | 58% | 51% | 54% | 59% | 51% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 51% | 54% | 59% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 42% | 47% | 39% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 66% | 54% | 58% | 60% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 57% | 51% | 57% | 59% | 53% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 42% | 51% | 48% | 42% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 58% | 51% | 70% | 59% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 81% | 71% | 72% | 77% | 71% | 70% |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 499 (0) | 426 (0) | 419 (0) | 1344 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 61 () | 69 () | 65 () | 195 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 4 (0) | 5 (0) | 7 (0) | 16 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 23 (0) | 10 (0) | 9 (0) | 42 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 132 (0) | 104 (0) | 112 (0) | 348 (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 | 56% | 50% | 6% | 54% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 48% | 8% | 52% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 54% | 47% | 7% | 52% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 47% | 9% | 51% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 60% | 50% | 10% | 56% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 56% | 3% | 58% | 1% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 58% | 48% | 10% | 55% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 49% | 10% | 52% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 63% | 47% | 16% | 54% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 44% | 13% | 54% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 45% | 29% | 16% | 46% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 37% | 8% | 45% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 48% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 60% | 5% | 50% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 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 | 79% | 68% | 11% | 71% | 8% |
| 2018 | 74% | 66% | 8% | 71% | 3% |
| 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 | 96% | 54% | 42% | 61% | 35% |
| 2018 | 89% | 57% | 32% | 62% | 27% |
| Compare | | 7% | | | |
| **GEOMETRY EOC** | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 55% | 45% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 97% | 55% | 42% | 56% | 41% |
| Compare | | 3% | | | |

## 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 | 22 | 40 | 38 | 30 | 42 | 36 | 30 | 51 | 29 | | |
| ELL | 27 | 50 | 47 | 47 | 59 | 63 | 20 | 80 | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 65 | | 88 | 63 | | | 100 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 37 | 48 | 51 | 46 | 50 | 43 | 33 | 67 | 89 | | |
| HSP | 53 | 56 | 50 | 59 | 66 | 65 | 59 | 68 | 79 | | |
| MUL | 52 | 54 | 38 | 55 | 49 | 50 | 69 | 77 | 82 | | |
| WHT | 62 | 57 | 48 | 70 | 58 | 54 | 70 | 84 | 80 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 51 | 40 | 60 | 54 | 51 | 58 | 74 | 76 | | |
| **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 | 21 | 45 | 44 | 35 | 54 | 44 | 33 | 54 | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 35 | 27 | 20 | 42 | 40 | | | | | |
| ASN | 85 | 82 | | 88 | 81 | | 100 | | 93 | | |
| BLK | 41 | 58 | 56 | 42 | 53 | 46 | 40 | 61 | 84 | | |
| HSP | 55 | 59 | 52 | 48 | 49 | 38 | 55 | 64 | 73 | | |
| MUL | 60 | 50 | 38 | 60 | 57 | 23 | 84 | 69 | 89 | | |
| WHT | 60 | 57 | 45 | 66 | 62 | 55 | 71 | 78 | 76 | | |
| FRL | 52 | 55 | 46 | 55 | 59 | 48 | 60 | 70 | 70 | | |

| 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 | 13 | 34 | 31 | 16 | 41 | 41 | 31 | 40 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 50 | 40 | 27 | 43 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 78 | | 79 | 78 | | 77 | 100 | 83 | | |
| BLK | 34 | 40 | 32 | 34 | 43 | 47 | 52 | 57 | 73 | | |
| HSP | 58 | 65 | 33 | 56 | 61 | 54 | 71 | 77 | 70 | | |
| MUL | 65 | 75 | 77 | 58 | 62 | 43 | 74 | 89 | 76 | | |
| WHT | 62 | 59 | 39 | 64 | 60 | 48 | 72 | 78 | 77 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 54 | 38 | 52 | 54 | 44 | 62 | 70 | 61 | | |

**2017 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 54 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 618 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

### Subgroup Data

#### Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| 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 | 50 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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.**

Proficiency of students with disabilities in Math and ELA. Two ESE teachers quit in October and students were with permanent substitutes for the remainder of the year. This led to a deficiency in our core math and ELA standards.

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

Our Asian population's proficiency in ELA decreased by 14%. However the average was still a 71. This is due to a decrease in our Asian population.

**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 state science average increased by 1% while ours decreased by 2%. This shows a gap in our science achievement. Teachers were adhering to the suggested rigor level within each standard.

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

Social Studies showed a growth of 7% from the previous year. Students who were not proficient were identified based on district scores and participated in a remediation course.

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

Attendance

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

1. 8th grade Science achievement
2. Students with a disability proficiency in Math
3. Students with a disability proficiency in ELA
4.
5.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Students proficiency for SWD |
| **Rationale** | Less than 1/3 of students with disabilities are proficient |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40% |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Teacher to student feedback |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | According to John Hattie (Visible Learning for Teachers), If students receive direct feedback on their writing they will become more successful in their abilities as well as self evaluation. |
| **Action Step** | |
| **Description** | 1. Professional development - ELA PLC - effective feedback in writing<br>2. Have teachers review info and develop action plan with Academic Coach/ district curriculum specialist<br>3. Plan needs for each grade level<br>4. Have teachers implement<br>5. Monitor through walk throughs<br>6. Review results every 2 weeks in PLC meetings<br>7. Adjust as needed |
| **Person Responsible** | Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Science |
| **Rationale** | Silver Sands science proficiency decreased by 2% while the state average increased 1%. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Science achievement increases from 59% to 65% |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Data chats |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | According to John Hattie, students will succeed with "targeted learning." Targeting learning occurs when teachers know where the lesson is going and ensure that the students know as well. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Identify students and share with teacher<br>2. Professional development on Learning Targets and Success Criteria<br>3. Identify standards students are not proficient in<br>4. Professional development - data chats<br>5. Professional development - feedback<br>6. Introduce students to plan<br>7. Administrators will monitor biweekly in PLC's. |
| **Person Responsible** | Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Math Proficiency for SWD |
| **Rationale** | Only 34% were proficient |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | 40% of students with a disability will be proficient in math |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Teacher Clarity |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | According to John Hattie, students will succeed with "targeted learning." Targeting learning occurs when teachers know where the lesson is going and ensure that the students know as well. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Identify students and share with teachers<br>2. Professional development - learning targets and success criteria<br>3. Identify standards that students are not proficient in<br>4. Implement in classrooms<br>5. Monitor teachers' use of learning targets and success criteris |
| **Person Responsible** | Amanda Wiles (anwiles@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).**

## 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: Students proficiency for SWD** | **$0.00** |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2 | III.A. | **Areas of Focus: Science** | **$0.00** |
| 3 | III.A. | **Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency for SWD** | **$0.00** |

| | Total: | $0.00 |
|---|---|---|