Atlantic High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

Demographics

Principal: Jason Watson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
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

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

At Atlantic High School, personal responsibility is an essential component of our curriculum. In order to emphasize and teach personal responsibility, we believe that teachers, students, and parents must clearly understand the role each must play in helping every one of our students to achieve academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Atlantic High School, every person is treated with dignity and respect. We welcome and encourage students, families, staff and community to learn together. Our students develop their unique talents to graduate with the greatest treasure—enthusiasm for lifelong learning as responsible, creative citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alves, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Hinson, Stephen	Principal	School Principal
Culver, Tracia	Assistant Principal	Data & Testing
Thompson, Althia	Assistant Principal	ESE
Doster, Julian	Assistant Principal	Safety & Security; Facilities
Robinson, Jennifer	Dean	Dean of Discipline
Casey, Kelli	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Jason Watson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
88

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	401	346	355	254	1356
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	35	36	37	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	60	39	34	215
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	88	73	50	315
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	49	29	24	187

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	114	77	61	45	297

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	42	32	19	2	95
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	19	7	62

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407	358	277	260	1302
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	43	52	48	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	6	21
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	123	97	72	59	351

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	24	20	16	13	73

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	378	373	293	263	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	15	16	10	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	50	44	26	193
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	98	63	52	265
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	97	72	59	351

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	91	83	59	31	264

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	41	40	21	3	105
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	28	18	8	73

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	52%	56%	43%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	49%	51%	43%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	37%	42%	38%	37%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	48%	48%	51%	52%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	49%	48%	48%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	38%	45%	40%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	81%	76%	68%	70%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	69%	73%	65%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	78%	72%	6%	67%	11%
2018	79%	65%	14%	65%	14%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-1%			
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	59%	63%	-4%	70%	-11%
2018	52%	63%	-11%	68%	-16%
Compare		7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	54%	-12%	61%	-19%
2018	41%	57%	-16%	62%	-21%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	55%	-6%	57%	-8%
2018	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Compare		-11%			

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	16	41	45	27	45	50	48	37		79	9
ELL		50									
ASN										100	55
BLK	36	50	47	31	48	39	67	45		81	18
HSP	42	36	21	43	38		63	52		67	58
MUL	53	58		47	45		73			69	27
WHT	56	54	52	56	51	59	87	73		86	45
FRL	42	48	50	43	51	53	75	56		80	35

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	23	38	28	22	21	12	46	21		80	29
BLK	28	37	21	32	32	25	58	30		93	30
HSP	49	43	40	48	44	45	83	50		80	69
MUL	59	50		57	58		100			92	45
WHT	58	51	33	63	56	41	88	67		90	62
FRL	44	42	28	47	45	35	77	50		82	49
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	15	37	31	26	34	31	53	39		73	13
BLK	23	27	22	31	41	33	52	40		85	34
HSP	43	36	31	54	50		86	85		87	40
MUL	35	38		63	40						
WHT	54	52	53	60	51	44	77	74		82	49
FRL	36	39	38	48	46	40	66	60		79	40

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	58
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	633
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

One of our low areas was in math achievement at 48% of students at proficiency in large part due to our Geometry scores, down 12% from last year. Staffing and lack of proper PLC work played a role in these scores. Our ELA lower quartile performance was a low area at 48% but an 18% increase from last year. Our SWD proficiency was at 40% and we attribute this to lack of proper collaborative practices and ineffective ESE case management in some areas. 9th grade ELA dropped from last year by 4% due in large part to new staffing. 10th grade ELA was at 50%; a 5% increase, but still an area of concern as it is below the state average.
Or final area of concern is the performance of our students with disabilities, scoring at a 40% proficiency rate. Staffing again has been of concern - hiring and retaining highly qualified ESE teachers to teach and support our students has been an ongoing issue. Without highly trained and qualified ESE teachers to support our most vulnerable population, we have seen students slip through the cracks and our overall SWD data is a reflection of this.

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

Our Geometry proficiency dropped by 12% although it continues to be above the district average. Staffing and lack of proper PLC work played a role in these scores

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 area with the largest gap in relation to the state average is our US History EOC scores at 62%, a full 11% lower than the state average. It was an area where we increased by 6% from last year due to a new PLC team that meets weekly and is using OP common assessment data to inform instruction. We hope to see that trend continue.

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

Most improved areas was out lower quartile learning gains in ELA - an 18% increase from last year and our lower quartile performance in math - a 14% increase. The teachers were provided with specific professional learning to understand learning gains, and identify and monitor their specific lower quartile population. They were also provided training on targeted interventions and support for lower quartile students. Additionally we began classroom based data chats & goal setting in all ELA/ Math classes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Concern is always the number of students already identified as EWS as 9th grade as well as the number of juniors and seniors at risk. We have a high number of 9th and 10th grade students with 2 or more early warning indicators (73 total). Those students will need additional supports and progress monitoring. It is also concerning to see the high level of students 9-12th grade (351 total) that are identified as level 1 on FSA - that is 25% of our student population.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Graduation Rate
4. SWD proficiency rates
5. Lower Quartile Progress

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 50% which was below the state average. Our ELA Learning Gains were 51% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 48%. Our SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students meeting with proficiency ELA. Further analysis revealed that students with disabilities; an ESSA targeted group, only performed at 16%, well below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency from 50% to 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-aligned instruction (Teacher Clarity)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Atlantic will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and our SIP goal

Person Responsible	Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly, school will assign high-impact ELA standard across all content areas; provide support strategies

Person Responsible	Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School will provide student progress monitoring lists to all teachers including lower quartile students, and level 1s & 2s.

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ELA/Reading teachers will implement a schedule for ELA data chats and student self-monitoring of progress

Person Responsible	Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage in structured PLCs and use TEAMS to collaborate with their PLC and access PLC framework/resources. PLC work will include monitoring of SWD data and documentation of support in PLC minutes/lesson plans.

Person Responsible	Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will provide PLC support and follow up

Person Responsible Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning

Person Responsible Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide feedback and follow up coaching.

Person Responsible Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Student surveys will be implemented each semester to collect feedback from students on the quality of instruction

Person Responsible Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 48% which was below the state average. 44% of students met with proficiency in Algebra and 49% in Geometry. Our Math Learning Gains were 50% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 50%. Our SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students meeting with proficiency in Math. Further analysis revealed that students with disabilities; an ESSA targeted group, only performed at 27%, well below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math proficiency from 48% to 53%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-aligned instruction (Teacher Clarity)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Atlantic will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and our SIP goal

Person Responsible	Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly, school will assign high-impact ELA standard across all content areas; provide support strategies

Person Responsible	Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School will provide student progress monitoring lists to all teachers including lower quartile students, and level 1s & 2s.

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ELA/Reading teachers will implement a schedule for ELA data chats and student self-monitoring of progress

Person Responsible	Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage in structured PLCs and use TEAMS to collaborate with their PLC and access PLC framework/resources. PLC work will include monitoring of SWD data and documentation of support in PLC minutes/lesson plans.

Person Responsible	Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will provide PLC support and follow up

Person Responsible Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning

Person Responsible Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide feedback and follow up coaching.

Person Responsible Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Student surveys will be implemented each semester to collect feedback from students on the quality of instruction

Person Responsible Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our graduation rate has increased but still remains below the state average at 85%. Our SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students' graduation from Atlantic in 4 years or less. Further analysis revealed that students with disabilities; an ESSA targeted group, had a graduation rate of 79%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase graduation rate from 85% to 90%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie. Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-tier approach to the identification and support of students with learning, behavior and attendance concerns. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and screening of all in the general education classroom. Struggling learners are provided with interventions and supports at increasing levels of intensity to accelerate their rate of learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Problem Solving Team coordination through guidance for EARLY identification of students in need of additional supports

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Guidance, College & Career readiness Coach, IEP Case Managers to provide monitoring and support of seniors at risk, student enrichment, acceleration

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School will provide teachers with data on juniors & seniors who are "at risk"

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

TEAMS group will be created to monitor at-risk seniors; manage data & contacts

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Faculty mentoring team will be established for at-risk seniors – each senior will be assigned to a faculty member for weekly check-ins

Person Responsible	Melanie Dabbe (mcdabbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly "Shark Attacks" with administration and guidance for senior data chats, progress monitoring, and goal setting

Person Responsible	Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School will implement College & Career Readiness Coach to increase opportunities, monitor acceleration rates

Person Responsible Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

D/F report reviewed quarterly to begin early intervention for underclassmen

Person Responsible Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Edgenuity for credit recovery /interventions in classroom

Person Responsible Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly reports submitted (via Microsoft Forms) to guidance on seniors in danger of failing to include parent contacts and interventions

Person Responsible Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SAT/ACT prep in 11/12 grade intensive reading classes

Person Responsible Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PERT prep embedded in 12th grade remedial math courses

Person Responsible Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our students with disabilities are performing disproportionately lower than their non disabled peers in all areas of the school report card. The overall proficiency rate for our SWD is 40%. Of considerate concern is the performance in ELA - only 16% of students meeting with proficiency and Math - only 27% of students meeting with proficiency. Additionally, the graduation rate for our students with disabilities is 6% lower than our school rate.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the overall performance of our students with disabilities by 5% to a 45% proficiency rate
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie. Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-tier approach to the identification and support of students with learning, behavior and attendance concerns. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and screening of all in the classroom. Struggling learners are provided with interventions and supports at increasing levels of intensity to accelerate their rate of learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Case management for SWD to include data chats & graduation progress monitoring

Person Responsible	Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE teachers to include self-advocacy in weekly instruction

Person Responsible	Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC work will include monitoring of SWD data and documentation of support in PLC minutes & teacher lesson plans.

Person Responsible	Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE teachers will provide core teachers with printed copy of ESE accommodations for each student quarterly

Person Responsible	Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will implement ALL ESE accommodations outlined in IEP; request support for areas of concern

Person Responsible	Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will review rosters weekly to ensure accurate identification of ESE students in class; request accommodations when new students enters class

Person Responsible	Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will email case manager for additional supports when needed

Person Responsible   Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

An additional area of focus for our school will be increasing our acceleration rate - another area of low hanging fruit. Although we have increased our acceleration by 4% from the previous year, we continue to fall short of county and state-wide averages. A strategic plan will be implemented starting the summer of 2020 which will include:
? Providing guidance counselors excel rosters by grade level of students who still need to earn acceleration
point to begin purposeful hand scheduling
? Review rosters of seniors w/out acceleration point & 3.0 GPA – schedule into SLS for fall (DSC waiver)
? Review rosters of Juniors for PERT testing in fall & SLS placement in January or senior year
? Review rosters of psychology students for FSA level 4/5s – move to AP Psychology (students w/o 4/5 to
DIT)
? Review rosters of physics students for FSA level 4/5s – move to AP Psychology
? Review rosters of advanced science classes for 4/5s – move to AP Biology/AP Environmental Science
? Review rosters of advanced math classes for 4/5s for AP Stat class

Implementation of New Scheduling Practices:
? Counselors will review student schedules every summer for appropriate placement into AP/honors courses
and acceleration opportunities.
? New 9th grade elective requirement - students will choose one or more:
AP Human Geography, Creative Writing (sem 1)/SLS Dual Enrollment Class (sem 2) *will PERT test in fall
DIT (if not taken in 8th grade)

Ongoing Monitoring During the 2020-2021 School Year:
? 12th grade students not yet earning an acceleration point (and not qualifying for SLS) will take CIW test this
year. Funds for voucher are TBD.
? Academy Team will meet during Pre-planning, review industry certification opportunities & add where
appropriate
? CTE/Academy teachers will identify students on their rosters that have not earned an acceleration point
? "Target Seniors" will be progress monitoring data point for monthly Academy meetings
? Data walls in CTE classrooms will be created to share data/successes for industry certification progress

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Yearly school orientation, school-based freshmen induction program, mentoring and student leadership are all critical components in establishing and maintaining positive relationships between teachers and students on campus as well as cultivating a sense of family.

Our freshmen orientation program is designed to acquaint new students with our campus and with our student leaders. Through this year's virtual orientation process, incoming 9th graders will be taken on a campus tour; lead by student athletes and leaders, learn about campus life and available activities, have the opportunity to receive volunteer training and more. Students will be educated on campus procedures for safety and security through a student-led video.

The majority of our teachers also serve as mentors to at-risk student populations to add another level of support for our Sharks and to create the supportive environment that many need to succeed. These programs include Check and Connect Mentoring for ESE at-risk students and mentoring for our at-risk seniors.

Through our guidance department and AVID program, students are exposed to college and career opportunities monthly through physical and virtual college tours, FAFSA completion, college application planning and support, and a college and career day that includes over 50 college/universities as well as local and state agencies/organizations such as Daytona Beach Police Department, Florida Fish and Wildlife and more.

Through an active School Advisory Committee that meets monthly, decisions are made regarding school vision, improvement goals, community involvement and the spending of funds to support school needs. Our SAC includes teachers, students, parents, school support staff, our town mayor, and a school board member. In addition to our SAC, our Academies have implemented an Academy Advisory Board for each of our nine career academies. These boards meet a minimum of twice a year and help advise the direction of our academies, create internship opportunities for students, support with fundraising, and collaborate with academy directors on curriculum and career opportunities for our academy students. Each academy has student ambassadors that also sit on these boards and participate in the process to give student voice.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.