

Volusia County Schools

# New Smyrna Beach High School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# New Smyrna Beach High School

1015 10TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://www.nsbhigh.com/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Timothy Merrick**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: A (64%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## New Smyrna Beach High School

1015 10TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://www.nsbhigh.com/>

### 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)
High School 9-12	No	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

### School Grades History

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

If NSBHS implements social and academic supports for equitable, ambitious standards-based learning through collective efficacy, then students' at-risk factors will decrease, and academic achievement will increase.

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

Prepare to get schooled!

### 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
Collins, Michaela	Teacher, K-12	Teacher and co-SAC chair
Croak, Deborah	Other	TOA - Testing, Graduation Assurance and SAC Chair
Zona, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Science teacher, SAC member
Meehl, Linda	Teacher, K-12	English teacher, department chair
Hopkins, Eleeta	Assistant Principal	ESE assistant principal
Stach, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant principal
Johnson, Jewel	School Counselor	Guidance Director
Merrick, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Assistant Principal
Krajewski, Matthew	Principal	
Tyson, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	US History teacher
Everidge, Erin	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, Graduation Assurance Team
Fuhr, Geraldine	Dean	Discipline TOA

### Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542	533	452	364	1891
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	61	51	66	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	14	5	7	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	132	91	41	462

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	59	48	38	222

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	59	39	20	222
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	8	3	0	42

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

142

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/19/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	40	26	21	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	131	83	50	406
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	101	92	52	318
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	132	91	41	462

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	59	48	38	249

## 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	51%	52%	56%	53%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	49%	51%	49%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	37%	42%	35%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	49%	48%	51%	50%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	49%	48%	40%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	38%	45%	29%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	76%	68%	81%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	69%	73%	74%	68%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	542 (0)	533 (0)	452 (0)	364 (0)	1891 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	86 ( )	61 ( )	51 ( )	66 ( )	264 (0)
One or more suspensions	30 (0)	14 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	56 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	198 (0)	132 (0)	91 (0)	41 (0)	462 (0)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
	2018	52%	50%	2%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	50%	5%	53%	2%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	72%	12%	67%	17%
2018	77%	65%	12%	65%	12%
Compare		7%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	63%	12%	70%	5%
2018	70%	63%	7%	68%	2%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	54%	-11%	61%	-18%
2018	42%	57%	-15%	62%	-20%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
2018	50%	55%	-5%	56%	-6%
Compare		4%			

### 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	41	24	59	47	63	46		61	7
ASN	55	36									
BLK	23	30	31	29	55	50	60	44		77	25
HSP	39	45	25	32	42		80	61		75	67
MUL	57	62		69	36		100	90		81	44
WHT	55	50	45	52	55	33	86	80		75	54
FRL	42	43	41	43	50	36	77	70		68	40
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	19	31	28	27	57		40	50		62	22
BLK	16	34	31	31	52		48	32		78	28
HSP	45	38	27	37	53		67	84		81	47
MUL	65	55		35	44	40	82	60		84	50
WHT	57	52	47	56	58	41	84	74		78	60
FRL	46	46	41	46	53	39	73	65		70	47
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	17	32	30	28	34	38	50	55		60	21
ASN	50	40		45	27						
BLK	25	41	45	24	40	35	41	39		73	31
HSP	53	54	30	58	53		84	80		84	44
MUL	54	48		40	41		80	50		91	48
WHT	55	50	35	52	39	29	83	79		76	53
FRL	45	45	32	44	40	31	76	66		70	42

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	46
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	42
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	52
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	67
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	59
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	51
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.**

SWD in ELA achievement showed the lowest performance, although our ELA learning gains increased considerably. ELA achievement stayed the same for 2018 and 2019. This highlights the need for us to closely monitor our SWD and ensure their instructional needs are being met in the classroom.

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

None of our ESSA subgroups fell below the 41% threshold. However, our SWD and BLK student populations hovered near the 41% threshold. But, both our SWD and BLK populations showed a moderate decline in Math achievement over last year. We didn't have huge declines in any one component, but our ELA and Math achievement components both showed declines of 3% from the previous year. Our ELA had the largest decline when compared to the State %. (51% vs. 56%)

**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.**

Our Math lowest 25th % had the largest gap compared to the state average. (36% vs. 45%) One of the major factors that may have contributed to that is staffing. There were some issues filling critical math positions in the beginning of the year due to teacher turnover. In addition, many students take Alg 1 in middle school and do not pass the Alg 1 EOC. When they retake it in high school, many are still unsuccessful because of the time expanse between the EOC and the course material.

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

Our Science and Social Studies components showed the most improvement over last year. Our school continued to reinforce PLC's, teacher planning and collaboration.

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

Attendance and referrals

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

1. SWD ELA and Math achievement
2. BLK ELA and Math achievement
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	SWD ELA achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Although this subgroup did not fall below the 41% threshold, this population of students stayed at the same level of achievement for ELA. Focusing on ELA achievement will help to improve learning gains and LQ performance.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is to increase SWD ELA achievement from 19% to 41%. This will help keep our ELA LG (42%) and LG L25% (41%) at the same level or higher.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated Instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Research shows that differentiation can have a significant impact on student growth. Tomlinson (2005), a leading expert in the field of differentiation, defines differentiated instruction as a philosophy of teaching that is based on the premise that students learn best when their teachers accommodate the differences in their readiness levels, interests and learning profiles. Another study by D. Fine indicated students' performances were significantly better when they were instructed through learning style approaches rather than traditional teaching methods.</p> <p>Differentiation provides multiple avenues of success that allows teachers to meet their students where they are. Differentiation allows tailoring instruction to meet individual needs. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and flexible grouping makes this a successful approach to instruction.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify professional learning needs of teachers related to Differentiation</li> <li>2. Training or refresher training in Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>3. Math and Reading Coach support for teachers (modeling or assisting with plans)</li> <li>4. Continued use of PLC's for teachers to discuss successes and issues using the strategy in class</li> <li>5. Use of AM office hours before 1st bell for students who need small group or one-on-one</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	SWD Math achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	SWD math achievement went from 27% to 24%. Focusing on math achievement overall will allow us to impact learning gains as well as the LG for the lower quartile.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is to increase math achievement from 24% to 41%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiation
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Research shows that differentiation can have a significant impact on student growth. Tomlinson (2005), a leading expert in the field of differentiation, defines differentiated instruction as a philosophy of teaching that is based on the premise that students learn best when their teachers accommodate the differences in their readiness levels, interests and learning profiles. Another study by D. Fine indicated students' performances were significantly better when they were instructed through learning style approaches rather than traditional teaching methods.</p> <p>Differentiation provides multiple avenues of success that allows teachers to meet their students where they are. Differentiation allows tailoring instruction to meet individual needs. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and flexible grouping makes this a successful approach to instruction.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify professional learning needs of teachers who want to use Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>2. Training or refresher training in differentiating math classrooms (Time, flexibility etc)</li> <li>3. Math and Reading Coach support for teacher (modeling or assisting with lesson plan)</li> <li>4. Continued use of PLC's for teachers to discuss successes and issues with differentiation in the classroom</li> <li>5. Use of AM office hours before 1st bell to help students who need a small group or one-on-one assistance</li> <li>6. Continued use of Test Prep USA for Alg 1 support</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)



#3	
<b>Title</b>	BLK ELA achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Although this subgroup improved to 23% from 16% last year, the subgroup federal index was 42%. We need to focus on key areas in this subgroup to maintain or exceed this %.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We hope to increase ELA achievement for this subgroup from 23% to 41%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated Instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Research shows that differentiation can have a significant impact on student growth. Tomlinson (2005), a leading expert in the field of differentiation, defines differentiated instruction as a philosophy of teaching that is based on the premise that students learn best when their teachers accommodate the differences in their readiness levels, interests and learning profiles. Another study by D. Fine indicated students' performances were significantly better when they were instructed through learning style approaches rather than traditional teaching methods.</p> <p>Differentiation provides multiple avenues of success that allows teachers to meet their students where they are. Differentiation allows tailoring instruction to meet individual needs. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and flexible grouping makes this a successful approach to instruction.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify professional learning needs teachers have for Differentiating in their classrooms.</li> <li>2. Training or refresher training for Differentiation. Could be a PD, learning walk, DPP cycle.</li> <li>3. Math and Reading Coach support for teacher (modeling lesson or assisting with lesson plans)</li> <li>4. Continued use of PLC's for teachers to discuss successes and issues they are having with using differentiation in their classrooms.</li> <li>5. Use of AM office hours before 1st bell for students who need one-on-one support or small group assistance.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4	
<b>Title</b>	BLK Math Achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	This subgroup decreased from 31% to 29% in Math achievement over last year. By targeting overall math achievement, we hope to increase Math LG and LG for L25% as well.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We hope to increase the overall math level from 29% to 41%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated Instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Research shows that differentiation can have a significant impact on student growth. Tomlinson (2005), a leading expert in the field of differentiation, defines differentiated instruction as a philosophy of teaching that is based on the premise that students learn best when their teachers accommodate the differences in their readiness levels, interests and learning profiles. Another study by D. Fine indicated students' performances were significantly better when they were instructed through learning style approaches rather than traditional teaching methods.</p> <p>Differentiation provides multiple avenues of success that allows teachers to meet their students where they are. Differentiation allows tailoring instruction to meet individual needs. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and flexible grouping makes this a successful approach to instruction.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify professional learning needs of teachers relating to Differentiation in the classroom.</li> <li>2. Training or refresher training on how to differentiate in their classrooms, including the use of technology to differentiate in a classroom</li> <li>3. Math and Reading Coach support for teacher (modeling, lesson plans, behavior issues)</li> <li>4. Continued use of PLC's for teachers to discuss successes and issues they are having when attempting to differentiate instruction in their classrooms.</li> <li>5. Use of AM office hours before 1st bell for students who need extra support</li> <li>6. Continued use of USA Test Prep for Alg 1 support (can be differentiated)</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Krajewski (mkrajews@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).**

We will continue to address school safety. All students will be required to wear student ID's and be in required dress code. Additional measures of security implemented are: Manned gate at front of school, one entry and exit point, additional stairwells added to improved student flow and continued use of resource deputy.

Our school has implemented a different ESE delivery model in our general education classes; Support Facilitation, along with consultation. This will add extra support to our SWD population, one of areas of focus.

All professional development will align with our areas of focus on the School Improvement Plan. (Impact of Zeros, Restorative Practices, Support Facilitation, Differentiation, Gradual Release, etc)

We continued with our Freshman Only first day of school. This initiative fosters relationships and allows students new to our school the time needed to explore and meet their teachers.

We plan to train and implement restorative practices and diversity, which will help us better target our at-risk groups.

We hope to establish a Graduation Assurance position that will assist in identifying our most at-risk students.

We will continue to work to improve our attendance through sharing of best practices, student follow up by teachers and guidance and student conferences.

Encourage teachers to have quarterly meetings with any student who has a D or F in their class. This could result in an action plan, attendance of office hours or remediation of work.

Reading and Math coach support for teachers.

Weekly PLC meetings allow teachers to regularly review formative and summative assessment data. This data helps to guide instruction according to student achievement and needs. PLCs work together to identify those students in need of additional instruction during office hours time.

Additionally, Eduphoria assessment data is utilized by teachers as a way to evaluate student achievement and adjust instruction according to students abilities and needs.

New Smyrna Beach High School also provides students the ability to attend an 8th period. This supplemented 8th period teacher provides math laboratory instruction and credit retrieval opportunities for students on campus that are working toward completing graduation requirements.

An e-Learning lab serves as a supplement for those students who are experiencing difficulty completing necessary courses for graduation.

Odyssey Lab periods have been created for all core subject areas: Mathematics, ELA, Science & Social Studies. This provides students additional opportunities to retrieve credit for core classes and progress towards meeting graduation requirements

Office Hours are 25 minutes a day each morning, Monday-Friday, and are provided to assist students having difficulty attaining the proficient or advanced level on course content.

Also, during the 2019 Summer, an Algebra 1 Boot-camp was provided to those students who did not meet the performance target on the FSA ALG 1 EOC. During the school year, reading and math boot camps are held for every ACT, SAT and PERT testing administration. There is also an FSA EOC

Algebra boot camp offered.

USA Test Prep is available for FSA ELA, Alg 1 EOC, PERT, ACT, SAT and Biology assessments. Teachers use data from these assessments to refine and reteach concepts in the classroom.

A Science Jumpstart program was offered to incoming 9th grade students to serve as a bridge to Biology Honors course content.

The CUDA Zone will continue to be used as an additional tutoring center during office hours. Students will have one-on-one assistance as well as access to on-line programs using computers.

The CTE Facilitator works with students entering the workforce after high school, to provide them with opportunities to tour local industries, job shadow, and submit a resume for possible employment. A room has been created to showcase these opportunities and allow students to visit and discuss options that might work for them beyond high school.