# Holly Hill School



# 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Holly Hill School

### 1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

## Demographics

## Principal: Robert Voges J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>PK-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (45%)<br>2017-18: C (44%)<br>2016-17: C (45%)<br>2015-16: C (43%)<br>2014-15: D (39%) |
| **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.](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

# Holly Hill School

## 1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

## http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/hollyhill/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) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Combination School PK-8 | Yes | 93% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| K-12 General Education | No | 63% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | C | C | C | 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.**

Holly Hill School is committed to empowering all students to become life-long learners and successful citizens through collaborative staff and community involvement.

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

At Holly Hill School, all students are empowered to become life-long learners through the interaction of all stakeholders that convey high expectations to students and one another.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Goropeuschek, Audrey | Dean | Student relations for 5th to 8th grade. |
| Watson, Jason | Principal | Monitoring of school wide improvment plan. |
| Iannarelli, Heather | Assistant Principal | Monitor plan provide input. |
| Zablo, Michael | Assistant Principal | Monitor plan provide input. |
| Gronka, Kelli | Teacher, K-12 | Monitor plan provide input. |
| Hanrahan, Kelly | Instructional Coach | Monitor plan provide input. |
| Brogan, Stephanie | Instructional Coach | Monitor plan provide input. (Math) |
| McAndrew, Amber | Other | Monitor plan provide title 1/SIG input. |
| Cone, Mallory | Other | Community liaison |
| Glaenzer, Stephanie | Other | SIG-Early Learning Specialist |

### 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 | 119 | 139 | 108 | 120 | 86 | 133 | 136 | 126 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1078 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 20 | 16 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 76 | 56 | 72 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 316 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

**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 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 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)**

**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 | 14 | 26 | 16 | 25 | 13 | 24 | 26 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 17 | 10 | 17 | 17 | 19 | 32 | 39 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 76 | 56 | 72 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 316 |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 37 | 37 | 38 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 |

## 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 | 35% | 54% | 61% | 36% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 43% | 53% | 59% | 46% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 32% | 44% | 54% | 36% | 43% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 34% | 55% | 62% | 42% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 40% | 52% | 59% | 48% | 52% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36% | 45% | 52% | 39% | 47% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 44% | 61% | 56% | 42% | 56% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 56% | 72% | 78% | 56% | 75% | 75% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 119 (0) | 139 (0) | 108 (0) | 120 (0) | 86 (0) | 133 (0) | 136 (0) | 126 (0) | 111 (0) | 1078 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 () | 20 () | 16 () | 14 () | 9 () | 7 () | 5 () | 8 () | 7 () | 107 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (0) | 5 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 12 (0) | 18 (0) | 10 (0) | 10 (0) | 55 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 8 (0) | 38 (0) | 76 (0) | 56 (0) | 72 (0) | 66 (0) | 316 (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 |
| 03 | 2019 | 29% | 58% | -29% | 58% | -29% |
|  | 2018 | 41% | 56% | -15% | 57% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 58% | -22% |
|  | 2018 | 32% | 54% | -22% | 56% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 56% | -17% |
|  | 2018 | 26% | 51% | -25% | 55% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 30% | 50% | -20% | 54% | -24% |
|  | 2018 | 28% | 48% | -20% | 52% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 28% | 47% | -19% | 52% | -24% |
|  | 2018 | 35% | 47% | -12% | 51% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 27% | 50% | -23% | 56% | -29% |
|  | 2018 | 35% | 56% | -21% | 58% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 32% | 60% | -28% | 62% | -30% |
|  | 2018 | 40% | 58% | -18% | 62% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 33% | 59% | -26% | 64% | -31% |
|  | 2018 | 45% | 60% | -15% | 62% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 60% | -19% |
|  | 2018 | 44% | 57% | -13% | 61% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 21% | 48% | -27% | 55% | -34% |
|  | 2018 | 23% | 49% | -26% | 52% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -23% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 23% | 47% | -24% | 54% | -31% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 27% | 44% | -17% | 54% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 17% | 29% | -12% | 46% | -29% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 37% | -20% | 45% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 56% | -17% | 55% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 38% | 57% | -19% | 48% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 60% | -18% | 50% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| 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 | 47% | 68% | -21% | 71% | -24% |
| 2018 | 51% | 66% | -15% | 71% | -20% |
| Compare | | -4% | | | |
| **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 | 69% | 57% | 12% | 62% | 7% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| Compare | | 21% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

## 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 | 13 | 26 | 28 | 11 | 27 | 27 | 17 | 12 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 44 | 33 | 38 | 47 | 39 | 41 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 37 | 32 | 19 | 29 | 31 | 32 | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 46 | 27 | 42 | 46 | 33 | 44 | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | 46 | | 57 | 62 | | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 46 | 35 | 41 | 46 | 39 | 54 | 66 | 82 | | |
| FRL | 34 | 43 | 31 | 33 | 39 | 36 | 45 | 53 | 84 | | |
| 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 | 7 | 33 | 35 | 10 | 32 | 38 | 14 | 6 | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 41 | 64 | 38 | 31 | 42 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 38 | 40 | 29 | 40 | 42 | 35 | 46 | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 46 | 63 | 40 | 42 | 38 | 57 | 69 | | | |
| MUL | 43 | 42 | | 34 | 33 | | 33 | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 48 | 47 | 44 | 61 | 52 | | |
| FRL | 33 | 41 | 44 | 36 | 43 | 43 | 40 | 59 | 67 | | |
| 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 | 6 | 26 | 25 | 12 | 34 | 37 | 10 | 13 | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 44 | 29 | 44 | 55 | 55 | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 39 | 28 | 31 | 43 | 34 | 27 | 55 | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 52 | 38 | 51 | 52 | 50 | 45 | | | | |
| MUL | 45 | 48 | | 53 | 55 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 49 | 38 | 45 | 49 | 36 | 49 | 54 | 67 | | |
| FRL | 34 | 45 | 35 | 41 | 48 | 39 | 40 | 54 | 56 | | |

## 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 | 46 |
| 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 | 52 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 457 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 20 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 31 |
| 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 | 41 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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.**

* ELA 35% Lowest Quartile at 32% which was 12% drop
*Math 34% Lowest Quartile at 36% which was a 7% drop
*Science 44% below District and State
*ESSA Subgroups Black 31% and SWD 20%
Contributing Factors:
*Lack of foundational skills
*Need for increased small group instruction

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

*ELA Learning Gains Lowest Quartile 32% dropped 12%
ELA Lowest Quartile ELL and Hispanic Subgroups dropped over 30%
Contributing Factors:
*The ELL population continues to increase.
*Need to allocate resources to meet the needs of the students.

**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.**

State MATH gaps 19%-34%
Contributing Factors:
*Lack of foundational skills
*Need for increased small group instruction

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

Middle School Acceleration due to increase in Algebra scores
*Tutoring
*Saturday Bout Camp
*Small group instruction

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

* Attendance concerns from K-8th grades
* Grades fourth - eighth Level 1 on State Assessment

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

1. Increase lowest quartile in Math
2. Increase lower quartile in Science
3. Increase lowest quartile in ELA

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Increase Math lowest quartile |
| **Rationale** | As a result of Math performance from the school report card 2018-2019, FSA Math. Math was decreased from 43% to 36%. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile in order to improve math learning gains and overall proficiency for all students. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Our goal is to increase math learning in the lowest quartile form 36% to 41%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Small Group Instruction- Teacher-led |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Small Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. Small group instruction allows teachers to differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | • Utilize intervention teachers for Math Instruction<br>• Review LQD/ Schedules to focus on student placement for interventions<br>• Facilitate professional learning including small group instruction<br>• Establish baseline data<br>• Conduct student data chat (minimum quarterly)<br>• Collaborate during weekly planning time (T-Time)<br>• Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains<br>• Attend Trainings/ conferences focused on SGI differentiation, PL and Math content / curriculum<br>• Remediation and tutoring small groups |
| **Person Responsible** | Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Increase Science Proficiency |
| **Rationale** | As a result of Science performance from the school report card 2018-2019, NGSSS. Science was increased from 41% to 44%. Our SLT has decided to focus on Science Proficiency in order to improve science learning gains and overall proficiency for all students. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Our goal is to increase science proficiency from 44% to 50%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Standards based Instruction |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Rigor is achieved by the careful scaffolding of information tasks according to Marzano. Also, teacher clarity has an Effect Size according to Hattie of .75. Teachers will analyze the standards and create rigorous tasks at PLCs. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | • Utilize coaches for standard based instruction in PLCs using strategies/ Data with collaborative groups<br>• Schedule learning walks<br>• Establish common assessments through collaborative planning with knowledgeable others<br>• Use Essential Standards through Professional Development (unpacking the standards, vertical articulation, Fair game Standards)<br>• Conduct for standards-based planning in PD for Collaboration<br>• Establish intervention for students<br>• Utilize IPGs/ Core Action 3<br>• Utilize coaching cycles<br>• Schedule walk-throughs and provide feedback<br>• Utilize Canvas for remediation |
| **Person Responsible** | Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Increase ELA lowest quartile |
| **Rationale** | As a result of ELA performance from the school report card 2018-2019, FSA ELA. ELA decreased from 44% to 32%. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA learning gains and overall proficiency for all students. |

| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Our goal is to increase ELA learning in the lowest quartile form 32% to 41%. |
|---|---|
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Small Group Instruction- Teacher-led |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Small Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and just Read Florida recommends small group instruction allows students to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner (SIPW pp.9). |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Utilize intervention teachers for ELA Instruction<br>• Review LQD/ schedules to focus on student placement for interventions<br>• Facilitate Professional Learning including small group instruction<br>• Establish baseline data<br>• Conduct student data chat (minimum quarterly)<br>• Collaborate during weekly planning time (T-Time)<br>• Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains<br>• Attend trainings / conferences focused on SGI differentiation, PL and ELA content / curriculum<br>• Remediation and tutoring small groups |
| **Person Responsible** | Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@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.**

• Family Nights to encourage parent involvement and increase home to school connections across content areas including Math, Reading, Science and SEL or Technology.
• FACT Fairs
• Provide supplies to homeless
• Business partners increased through active involvement
• Outreach programs for families and community including Adopt a Block

**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.**

• Guidance Counselors for Elementary and Middle Schools
• SEL Counselors (TOAs) for Elementary and Middle write weekly curriculum.
• SEL Room
• House Behavior System
• Counselors and mentors through outside agencies

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

• Kindergarten family nights to train parents and support home to school connection
• DSC Reading Practicum working with students K-2 during extended day
• Additional personnel working with students on letters
• Increase blended learning experiences
• Early Learning Coalition partnership to provide resources to families
• AVID strategies
• Identify the needs of students
• Use of portfolios for transfers to high schools

At this time, Holly Hill School does not have migratory students. In the event, students are identified, we will revisit the SIP to include the necessary resources.

**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.**

• Inventory maintained
• Problem-solving activities
• SIG provides technology and technology programs in conjunction with Title 1
• Title 1 is responsible for adding personnel including Intervention Teachers and Coaches

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

• AVID visitations to high schools and colleges
• College T-Shirt Day
• Established partnerships

- Community field trips
- Programs
- Activities

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase Math lowest quartile | | | | $196,347.69 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $54,258.36 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Math Coach, Stephanie Friedman* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $48,475.33 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Adrienne Donald* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $46,665.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Kamisha Payne* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $46,949.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher,Lakeisha Byrd* | | | |
| **2** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Increase Science Proficiency** | | | | **$65,880.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $62,880.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Science Coach* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | | $500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Technology set aside* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | | $2,500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Uniforms and supplies for homeless students* | | | |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Increase ELA lowest quartile** | | | | **$259,906.90** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $78,115.56 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Reading Coach* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $63,630.24 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Sue Gallico* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $57,079.06 |
| | | | *Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Kim Johns* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | | $15,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Attend academic conferences* | | | |
| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | | $10,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Family Nights- personnel and materials/ supplies* | | | |

| | | | 2721 - Holly Hill School | Title, I Part A | | $36,082.04 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Notes: Tutoring | | | |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$522,134.59** |