David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: William Dunnigan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 (59%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision- We believe that an orderly and safe campus promotes an optimum learning environment by encouraging and supporting citizenship.
We believe that all our children will be successful in high school and become
responsible and contributing members of society.
We believe in a well-balanced, comprehensive, and success-oriented curriculum that responds to the physical, intellectual, social, and emotional needs of our students.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dunnigan, William	Principal	Oversees administrative staff and acts as instructional leader for David C. Hinson Middle school. Facilitates management of resources (human and other) as well as facilities management and operations of the school on a daily basis.
Fulcher, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Conducts discipline for 8th grade class, oversees 8th grade guidance, zone variance, 8th grade lunch supervision, gifted/504 8th grade students, curriculum/data coordinator/program of studies, SIP/SAC administrator, and testing coordinator for the school.
Stevenson, Delecia	Assistant Principal	Discipline for ESE grades 6-8, guidance grade 7, zone variances ESE grades 6-8, 7th grade lunch supervision, gifted/504 grade 7 students, ESE coordinator, blood borne pathogens/Right To Know, Transportation contact, summer school coordinator, faculty meeting coordinator, substitutes, new teacher contact, staff/student recognition/marquee, ESE Teacher/electives evaluations, and 504 contact.
Vetter, Joe	Teacher, K-12	History Department Head
Prather, David	Teacher, K-12	Electives Department Chair
Crain, Abigail	Teacher, K-12	SAC Head
Phelps, Mindi	Teacher, K-12	Language Art Department Head
Copello, Matt	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head
Sprague, Jeffrey	Teacher, K-12	P.E. Department Head
Watson, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head
Tozer, Rebecca	School Counselor	Guidance Department Head
Smith, William	Assistant Principal	School Maintenance Supervision

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/1/2018, William Dunnigan

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
60

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 (59%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	287	257	304	0	0	0	0	848
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	32	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	33	36	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	30	51	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	35	62	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	46	57	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	43	52	0	0	0	0	143
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	43	42	64	0	0	0	0	149

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	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	43	29	0	0	0	0	119

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	43	29	0	0	0	0	119

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	51%	54%	52%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	54%	52%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	47%	35%	40%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	63%	54%	58%	61%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	54%	51%	57%	55%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	51%	35%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	58%	51%	67%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	71%	72%	70%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	53%	50%	3%	54%	-1%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	47%	5%	52%	0%
	2018	53%	47%	6%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	37%	7%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	62%	57%	5%	48%	14%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	50%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	68%	9%	71%	6%
2018	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
Compare	5%				
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	54%	36%	61%	29%
2018	95%	57%	38%	62%	33%
Compare	-5%				
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	55%	36%	57%	34%
2018	100%	55%	45%	56%	44%
Compare	-9%				

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	42	43	31	46	40	22	50			
ELL	42	65	54	63	61		33				
ASN	78	65		89	66		89	76	83		
BLK	35	46	47	44	50	42	41	70	65		
HSP	39	49	57	44	52	40	36	83			
MUL	45	50	53	60	57	65	57	75	90		
WHT	57	53	47	69	54	49	72	83	77		
FRL	39	48	47	53	51	45	51	75	64		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	44	42	29	47	49	38	42			
ELL	30	38	27	53	48						
ASN	76	70	42	88	70		84	82	93		
BLK	41	49	43	44	54	46	47	60	78		
HSP	56	58	47	57	57	59	53	54	100		
MUL	49	48	31	55	55	47	77	69	82		
WHT	63	58	49	71	61	55	77	81	85		
FRL	46	51	44	54	56	48	55	65	79		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	9	31	33	11	34	33	18	18			
ELL	15	29	30	44	44						
ASN	77	69		90	76		92	76	100		
BLK	34	41	37	41	44	34	40	56	73		
HSP	42	51	36	49	50	38	62	74	60		
MUL	53	45	20	60	50	29	64	80	67		
WHT	58	56	36	67	58	36	72	75	76		
FRL	37	43	34	46	46	35	53	55	61		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	49
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	50
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	61
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	54
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.

The eight grade ELA scores were compared to the state and found to be the lowest-performing subject area as the state achievement level was 1% higher than David C. Hinson students. Sixth grade students performed at 51% proficiency and the state overall achievement performed at 52%. Contributing factors were: chronic absences, retentions, and a high amount of ESE/SWD students. In addition, due to COVID-19, this year we must be mindful of the effects of school being out since March of the previous year. This is a total of 5 months of alternative instruction and/or no instruction.

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

Student achievement declines compared to the prior year are as follow:
- 8th grade ELA by 16% points
- 8th grade math by 5% points
- Algebra by 9% points
Factors that contributed to the decreases in student achievement were:
- Changes in district assessment policies and platforms (iReady) for math
- Inconsistent instructional strategies and collaborative practices

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Components with the greatest gap compared to state averages were:
- SWD by 1% point
- 6th-grade ELA by 1% point
- 8th-grade ELA by 7% points
- 8th-grade Math by 7% points
Factors that contributed to the greatest gaps compared to the state average were:
- Changes in district assessment practices and platform (iReady)
- Changes in state placement policies (level 3 students all going into Algebra, leaving level 1 and 2 students in the regular courses)
- Inconsistent instructional strategies and collaborative practices

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

Data components that showed most improvements were:
- Civics EOC by 5% points
- 7th-grade and 7th Advance math by 4% points
Actions taken that resulted in improvements in these areas:
- Lunch and after-school tutoring
- EOC and FSA Bootcamp and Reviews

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

Two potential areas of concern:
- The upcoming 8th-grade cohort has the highest amount of student failure rate in ELA and Math
- The upcoming 7th graders have the highest levels of attendance issues.
- Distance learning characterized by missed instruction - due to COVID-19.

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

1. Inclusion practices for students with disabilities.
2. Increase FSA overall achievement levels in ELA and Math, with a focus on the lowest quartile.
3. Increase pedagogical knowledge of depth of knowledge integration during instruction and in assessments.
4. Adding intensive math courses, Achieve 3000 for reading and co-taught for Social Studies, Science, Math, and ELA.
5. Review previous year 4th quarter content throughout the year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to NCBI, individualized interventions for students with disabilities help differentiate core instruction for struggling students in a timely manner. Additionally, state data indicates they are our lowest-performing subgroup. The school's SWD subgroup fell below the 41% threshold established by the state.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase students with disabilities proficiency from 37% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delecia Stevenson (drsteven@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive practices for SWD to include ESE/Core teacher collaboration to promote best inclusive instructional practices and timely intervention based on progress monitoring of formative in preparation for unit summative. Teachers will use a variety of assessments according to students' disabilities to evaluate understanding and will make remediation opportunities available to avoid SWD being retained.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose of implementing the above strategies is to increase teacher knowledge in inclusive practices for SWD, which will have a positive effect on SWD achievement levels. Findings in The Institute of Education Sciences (ERIC) establishes that Inclusive Lecture Strategies have an effect size of 0.67 and understanding accommodations for inclusiveness an effect size of 0.64.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will present the school data that reflect SWD as an area of need and therefore, a priority.
2. Provide professional development to ESE and Core teachers in the area of collaborative practices and planning for students in this subgroup, and in inclusive instructional and intervention practices.
3. Professional learning communities will assess and review data on a weekly basis to drive instruction, review groupings and plan interventions.
4. The administration will conduct learning walks and provide timely feedback on strategies herein to teachers.

Person Responsible Katherine Fulcher (ksfulche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our needs assessment and analysis has revealed that the school's ELA proficiency levels have suffered a decrease from the previous year and is currently at a 52% (6% points less), ELA learning gains at 52% (4% points less), and the lowest quartile at 47% (2% points less).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA levels as follows: - Overall achievement from 52% to 58% - Learning gains from 54% to 60% - Lowest quartile from 47% to 52%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mindi Phelps (mmwilson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Timely interventions and remediation opportunities - Formative evaluation - Reading program (Achieve 3000)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose of implementing the above strategies is to increase student achievement in ELA. According to Hattie's Visible Learning the following effect size support the strategies above: - Intervention for learning disable or interventions for disabled = 0.77 - Formative evaluations = 0.68 - Reading Programs = 0.60; In addition, evidence for ESSA recognized Achieve 3000 for demonstrating strong evidence of efficacy based on results from a third-party randomized controlled trial study of its solutions for middle and high school students with a positive effect size of +0.29. - Professional development = 0.45

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will present the school data that reflects ELA, specifically the lowest quartile, as an area of need and therefore, a priority.
2. Provide professional development to ESE and Core teachers in the area of collaborative practices and planning for students in this subgroup, and in inclusive instructional and intervention practices for all students. Additionally, reading teachers will be trained in Achieve 3000 for the immediate implementation this year.
3. Conduct monthly progress monitoring of ESE, ELL, and intervention practices in conjunction with the ESE department.
4. The Reading Department PLC will assess and review data on a weekly basis to drive instruction, review groupings, and plan interventions.
5. Continuation of the New Teacher Support program.
6. The administration will conduct learning walks and provide timely feedback on instructional strategies herein to teachers.

Person Responsible	William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our needs assessment and analysis has revealed that the school's Math proficiency levels have suffered a decrease from the previous year and is currently at 63% (5% points less compared to state average), math learning gains at 54% (6% points less from the previous school year), and lowest quartile in math at 47% (6% points less from the previous school year).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math achievement levels as follows: - Overall achievement from 63% to 68% - Learning gains from 54% to 57% - Lowest quartile 47% to 53%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Copello (mjcopell@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Timely interventions and remediation opportunities - Formative evaluation - Math intensive program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose of implementing the above strategies is to increase student achievement in Math. According to Hattie's Visible Learning the following effect size support the strategies above: - Intervention for learning disable or interventions for disabled = 0.77 - Formative evaluations = 0.68 - Math Programs = 0.49 - Professional development = 0.45

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal will present the school data that reflects Math, specifically the lowest quartile, as an area of need and therefore, a priority.
2. Provide professional development to ESE and Core teachers in the area of collaborative practices and planning for students in this subgroup, and in inclusive instructional and intervention practices for all students. Additionally, intensive math teacher(s) will be supported by district staff that designed the programs.
3. Conduct monthly progress monitoring of ESE, ELL, and intervention practices in conjunction with the ESE department.
4. The Math Department PLC will assess and review data on a weekly basis to drive instruction, review groupings, and plan interventions.
5. Continuation of the New Teacher Support program.
6. The administration will conduct learning walks and provide timely feedback on instructional strategies herein to teachers.

Person Responsible	William Smith (wtsmith1@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.

1. The school employs a Social Emotional Learning Curriculum and teacher/counselor. They provide lesson plans for teachers and the team teaches with them when time permits. Counselors conduct small group and individual, short term counseling for students. Mr. Case, Dean of Student Relations, will provide training to new faculty members in Restorative Justice practices. All faculty members will employ Restorative Justice in relation to disciplinary issues on campus.
2. The school works with feeder elementary schools to assist the incoming sixth graders with registration and becoming familiar with middle school requirements. Each spring, parents of incoming 6th graders are invited to an orientation to become familiar with the school. Prior to the beginning of the school year, the guidance department offers a program called "Step Up" to welcome the sixth graders, review expectations of middle school, dress code, and to tour the campus. This year it will be virtual due to COVID-19.
3. The eighth-graders are invited to the high school showcase to learn about the various programs high schools offer. The school will advertise the high school orientation schedule. Students will meet with representatives of the different high schools to discuss their courses.
4. Promote virtual and digital interactions for the development of 21st Century skills.
5. Provide access to educational opportunities and continued instruction for students that are forced to stay at home because of the pandemic.
6. Provide virtual/digital Professional Development to enhance best practices (attendance, grading, enrollment).
7. Ensure resources and operational processes are strategically aligned to the school-wide improvement plan.
8. Other subject areas will support student achievement and academic gains by providing cross-curricular opportunities that align with the school improvement plan.

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.

- David C. Hinson's school community will provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Mr. Case, Dean of Student Relations, develops community partnerships to further student participation in the community. National Junior Honor Society and the Student Government Association volunteers in the community to increase positive awareness of the school. Stakeholders are invited to be part of the Parent-Teacher Association and School Advisory Council. Promoting social media sites will be a priority this year, the entire school community will be involved in this effort.
- The school-based leadership team assesses and identifies school needs and resources (both material and

personnel) through data analysis. Areas of focus are prioritized and a school improvement plan built, which includes academic and behavioral support that aligns with needs and resources. Strength and specialization are considered to assign functions teams such as Problem Solving Team, Behavioral Leadership Team, and Professional Learning Communities. Funds, services, and programs are distributed according to areas of focus and the overall school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving process (problem identification, analysis of the problem, intervention implementation, and response to intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide and school-wide issues are addressed systematically to ensure allocation of resources and personnel have the highest impact on student achievement.

- The school offers students elective courses in art, criminal justice, STEM, digital literacy critical thinking, music, business, and culinary. Many of these courses focus on job skills and help to develop a work ethic that is necessary for successful future employment. Each year, students and parents participate in course selection that exposes them to the following year's curriculum that assists in future course selections. Students have the option to participate in a CHOICE program. Sixth-graders will focus on learning styles and interest inventories. Seventh-graders will use the inventories to identify career clusters. Eigth-graders will use the career clusters to develop a four-year educational/career plan. Students will also be invited to the high school showcase to help with academic planning. Seveth-grade students attend a STEM day at Embry Riddle University to encourage science, technology, engineering, robotics, and mathematics.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**