

Volusia County Schools

New Smyrna Beach Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

New Smyrna Beach Middle School

1200 S MYRTLE AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/newsmyrnabeach/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Porter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

New Smyrna Beach Middle School

1200 S MYRTLE AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/newsmyrnabeach/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	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	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.

Our mission at New Smyrna Beach Middle School is to provide a safe environment which promotes respect and motivates students to learn, achieve, and act responsibly in order to achieve their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe education is the shared responsibility of the student, home, school, and community.

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
Farajallah, Sabra	Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all instructional staff, supervising all support staff, implementation of instructional practices, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, assign School Leadership Team, coordinate meetings of School Leadership Team, engage with all stakeholders, and final approval of School Improvement Plan.
Hammond, Jana	Dean	The jobs duties include supervising all Social Emotional Learning instruction, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all 6th grade stakeholders.
Butrico, Kristin	Assistant Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all 8th grade stakeholders.
Bellantoni, Ann	Instructional Coach	Work collaboratively with teachers to complete coaching cycles which include: lesson planning, preconferences, observations, post-conferences, and analyzing student learning. Be a thought partner with teachers and not evaluative. Support teachers in implementing standards-based lessons through modeling and co-teaching. Facilitate professional learning that focuses on curriculum standards and teaching practices Support professional learning communities using data and examining curriculum standards. Serve with the school leadership team.
Keeran, Erin	Teacher, K-12	The jobs duties include monitoring and mentoring all Social Studies instructors, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum area of Social Studies, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in assigned department, and participate in some recommended meetings of School Leadership Team.
Bender, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	The jobs duties include monitoring and mentoring all Science instructors, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum area of Science, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in assigned department, and participate in some recommended meetings of School Leadership Team.
Sylvester, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	The jobs duties include monitoring and mentoring all Math instructors, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum area of Math, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in assigned department, and participate in some recommended meetings of School Leadership Team.
Gold, Ericka	Teacher, K-12	The jobs duties include monitoring and mentoring all Science instructors, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum area of

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Science, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in assigned department, and participate in some recommended meetings of School Leadership Team.
Carey, Amy	Assistant Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all assigned staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all 7th grade stakeholders.
Haire, Robin	Assistant Principal	The jobs duties include supervising all assigned ESE staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meetings of School Leadership Team, and engage with all ESE stakeholders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Rebecca Porter

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

73

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)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	349	340	343	0	0	0	0	1032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	15	15	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	23	31	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	65	73	0	0	0	0	208
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	64	89	0	0	0	0	220

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	64	48	70	0	0	0	0	182

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	17	21	16	0	0	0	0	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4	0	0	0	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

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	396	407	412	0	0	0	0	1215
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	38	33	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	10	2	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	142	125	0	0	0	0	375

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	34	30	25	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	396	407	412	0	0	0	0	1215
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	38	33	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	10	2	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	142	125	0	0	0	0	375

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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 34 30 25 0 0 0 0 89

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 0 0 0 0 5

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

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%	51%	54%	52%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	54%	52%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	42%	47%	37%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	54%	58%	52%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	44%	51%	57%	50%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	51%	47%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	58%	51%	59%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	71%	72%	75%	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	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	48%	47%	1%	52%	-4%
	2018	45%	47%	-2%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	48%	0%	55%	-7%
	2018	52%	49%	3%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
	2018	34%	44%	-10%	54%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	24%	29%	-5%	46%	-22%
	2018	37%	37%	0%	45%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	57%	4%	48%	13%
	2018	64%	60%	4%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	72%	68%	4%	71%	1%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
Compare		0%			
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	77%	54%	23%	61%	16%
2018	87%	57%	30%	62%	25%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	55%	28%	57%	26%
2018	84%	55%	29%	56%	28%
Compare		-1%			

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	18	34	34	18	35	29	33	32	46		
ASN	70	70		90	40						
BLK	24	34	30	22	39	35	33	60			
HSP	60	51	42	58	48	60	83	72	71		
MUL	43	54	59	30	31	29	52	50	60		
WHT	53	48	35	55	45	39	65	75	76		
FRL	41	43	34	41	42	39	55	64	68		
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	18	38	30	18	39	35	29	46	62		
ASN	70			80							
BLK	23	39	33	31	41	39	38	56			
HSP	49	35	25	53	46	46	69	73	88		
MUL	43	48	39	50	51	36	54	76	70		
WHT	54	47	37	56	56	44	68	75	78		
FRL	42	42	33	44	48	37	59	68	68		

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	14	32	33	19	42	44	18	39			
ASN	69	62		83	75						
BLK	17	30	26	26	32	30	22	64	69		
HSP	54	58	82	53	49	20	63	87	62		
MUL	48	44	25	37	51	71	50	73			
WHT	56	54	37	55	51	51	63	76	83		
FRL	43	48	37	43	46	46	48	67	75		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	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	68
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	45
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	55
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	47
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.

Lowest performance component is 8th grade math as the score moved from 37% to 24% which was negative 13%. Contributing factors teacher turn over, class is all lower quartile students and students with disabilities. Another, lower performance component is Algebra 1 as the score moved from 87% to 77% which is negative 10%. Contributing factors could be not using ALEK system in the classroom, teacher use of resources, and teacher knowledge of standards in the FSA.

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

Lowest performance component is 8th grade math as the score moved from 37% to 24% which was negative 13%. Contributing factors teacher turn over, class is all lower quartile students and students with disabilities.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was the 8th grade math where the state score was 46% and our school obtained a 24% which is a difference of 22%. Contributing factors of teacher turn over, class is all lower quartile students and students with disabilities.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 7th grade math which moved from 34% to 46% which is an increase in 12%. Contributing factors were classroom management, engaging lessons, coach support, teacher willingness to try new strategies, in class remediation, and student-based learning.

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

The EWS data shows that the number of students who fail their ELA course and Math course are much lower then the number of students who are scoring level 1 on ELA and Math assessments.

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

1. 8th Grade Math
2. Algebra 1
3. ELA lowest quartile
4. reduction of referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The results of our needs analysis and assessment revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 50%, ELA learning gains was at 48%, and the lowest quartile performed at 36%. The School Leadership Team believes that in supporting and focusing on the instructional practice of ELA including reading and writing standards that progress together with the use of accompanying texts for writing that embeds four strands of foundations, reading, communication, and vocabulary will aid in the improvement in proficiency in ELA for all students. The focus on instructional practice specifically relating to ELA will also aid in the improvement of the lowest quartile students who performed at 36% with the state average at 47%. The lowest quartile students include our two targeted ESSA subgroups of students with disabilities and African American students. Students with disabilities data revealed ELA proficiency was at 18%, ELA learning gains was at 34% and the lowest quartile performed at 34%. African American students' data revealed ELA proficiency was at 24%, ELA learning gains was at 34% and the lowest quartile performed at 30%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the ELA lowest quartile from 36% to 54% (47% state average/ 42% was district average).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented is standards-based instruction through all stakeholders of the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in ELA. John Hattie's effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .75, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers is .72, learning goals vs no learning goals .68. Research on standards-based instruction have been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate.

Action Steps to Implement

IPG tool training for new staff and IPG tool implementation for veteran staff who have completed the IPG Tool training previously.

Person Responsible Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE subgroup and diversity training to aid in differentiation of standards-based activities for all instructional staff.

Person Responsible Robin Haire (rlhaire@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Common planning time for all ELA teachers built into their regular daily schedule.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Focused ESE collaboration together with general education ELA teachers during common planning times.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC meetings weekly for all ELA teachers to collaborate with meeting minutes and administration or instructional coach support.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Lesson standards posted in every classroom for students' reference in a commonly utilized area of the classroom.

Person Responsible Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Standards-based ELA resources will be made available for teacher planning and for student use in the classroom or on Volusia Live.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ELA standards-based data chats in PLC time using school and district based assessments including student subcategories broken down for more specific data drive analyzing.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ELA instructional coaching available to teachers during planning or for in classroom assistance.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Standards-based remediation plan based on common assessment data to reduce achievement gaps.

Person Responsible Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walk throughs to observe teacher and student use and knowledge of standards during instruction in the classroom and on Volusia Live.

Person Responsible Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Learning walks with staff and district personnel in ESE and curriculum areas to ensure proper and timely use of standards within the daily instruction in the classroom and through Volusia Live.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Small group standard based instruction coaching including training, mentoring, and observations.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of targeted reading programs to reduce achievement gaps of the lowest quartile.

Person Responsible Amy Carey (alcarey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The results of our needs analysis and assessment revealed that our math proficiency was at 51%, math learning gains was at 44% and the lowest quartile performed at 39%. The School Leadership Team believes that in supporting and focusing on the instructional practice of Math including standards that progress together within the following five domains of number sense and operations, fractions, algebraic reasoning, measurement, geometric reasoning, data analysis, and probability will aid in the improvement in proficiency in Math for all students. The focus on instructional practice specifically relating to Math will also aid in the improvement of the lowest quartile students who performed at 39% with the state average at 51%. The lowest quartile students also include our two targeted ESSA subgroups of students with disabilities and African American Students. Students with disabilities data revealed math proficiency was at 18%, math learning gains was at 35% and the lowest quartile performed at 29%. African American students' data revealed math proficiency was at 22%, math learning gains was at 39% and the lowest quartile performed at 35%.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase the math lowest quartile from 39% to 54% (51% state average/ 42% was district average)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented is standards-based instruction through all stakeholders of the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in math. John Hattie's effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .75, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers is .72, learning goals vs no learning goals .68. Research on standards-based instruction have been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate.

Action Steps to Implement

IPG tool training for new staff and IPG tool implementation for veteran staff who have completed the IPG Tool training previously.

Person Responsible

Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE subgroup and diversity training to aid in differentiation of standards-based activities for all instructional staff.

Person Responsible

Robin Haire (rlhaire@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Common planning time for all Math teachers built into their regular daily schedule.

Person Responsible

Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Focused ESE collaboration together with general education Math teachers during common planning times.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC meetings weekly for all Math teachers to collaborate with meeting minutes and administration or instructional coach support.

Person Responsible Jennifer Sylvester (jhsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Lesson standards posted in every classroom for students' reference in a commonly utilized area of the classroom.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Standards-based Math resources will be made available for teacher planning and for student use in the classroom or on Volusia Live.

Person Responsible Jennifer Sylvester (jhsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Math standards-based data chats in PLC time using school and district-based assessments including student subcategories broken down for more specific data driven analyzing.

Person Responsible Jennifer Sylvester (jhsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Math instructional coaching available to teachers during planning or for in classroom assistance.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Standards-based remediation plan based on common assessment data to reduce achievement gaps.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walk throughs to observe teacher and student use and knowledge of standards during instruction in the classroom and on Volusia Live.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Learning walks with staff and district personnel in ESE and curriculum areas to ensure proper and timely use of standards within the daily instruction in the classroom and through Volusia Live.

Person Responsible Jennifer Sylvester (jhsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Small group standard based instruction coaching including training, mentoring, and observations.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of targeted math programs to reduce achievement gaps of the lowest quartile.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The School Leadership Team believes that in focusing on the area of leadership specifically relating to specific teacher feedback we can use effective communication to teachers through data collection, observation, and commentary that will increase collective efficacy throughout the school leading to high shared responsibility in increasing our overall school grade. Specific teacher feedback will provide data including their school-based assessment data, district assessment data, state assessment data, discipline data, attendance data, and observation data. This specific teacher feedback will help to drive decisions throughout the school campus including during administrative meetings, leadership team meetings, PLC meetings, and teachers' instruction in the classroom. Specific teacher feedback will also be used to guide growth and development throughout the school campus to ensure high level rigor in all classrooms. Specific teacher feedback will also aid in the aligning of all administrators, teachers, and students to ensure appropriate rigorous and effective instruction for all.

Measurable Outcome: School grade rise from a C to a B.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy the leadership team has chosen is Collective Efficacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for using the strategy of Collective Efficacy is that teachers' specific feedback ensures all teachers have rigorous classroom instructions and expectations based on data and observations. John Hattie's effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, Hattie teacher feedback .70, and teacher clarity .75.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration data collection walks will be completed and shared to specific teachers electronically to give timely feedback.

Person Responsible: Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

During PLC meetings, there will be specific teacher analysis of data to share feedback on effective strategies to increase rigor in every classroom.

Person Responsible: Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Specific teacher feedback during VSET meetings to drive teacher's intentional professional growth to create effective classroom environments.

Person Responsible: Sabra Farajallah (safaraja@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring school-based formative and summative assessments to give specific teachers feedback to ensure reflection of students' mastery of standards.

Person Responsible: Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly discipline data analysis sessions for teacher feedback to ensure proper behavioral supports have been implemented in the classroom to promote student success.

Person Responsible Jana Hammond (jrhammon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly attendance data analysis will take place during the grade level articulations to give teachers specific feedback on their assigned students.

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District assessment data analysis during PLC's to compare our school's implementations and giving specific teacher feedback on strategies to ensure student success in standards-based instruction meets district aligned rigor.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

IPG tool used to give specific teacher feedback on the classroom instruction observations.

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of the instructional coach to observe and give specific teacher feedback based on the classroom observation

Person Responsible Ann Bellantoni (atbellan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor the academic, attendance, and discipline of the ESSA subgroups to be shared with the specific teachers constantly as data is provided

Person Responsible Kristin Butrico (kmbutric@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.

One main school wide improvement priority goal is to reduce the number of discipline referrals given to students. The goal is to reduce the number of referrals to be under 3000 (3119 is the number of referrals for 2019-2020 school year up to March) for the 2020-2021 school year. This school wide goal will be met using strategies such as school wide training on discipline practices, restorative practices, Social Emotional Learning lessons provided for teachers and students, grade level meetings having referral data chats and procedural monitoring, at least five expectations of classroom procedures for each teacher, teacher to teacher mentoring for classroom procedural practices, learning walks to ensure teachers are giving explicit and consistent classroom procedures, modeling of conversations with students and families, using technology of Zoom or Teams to observe classroom procedures used throughout campus. Another school wide improvement priority is to involve all stakeholders in positive interactions of students and stakeholders throughout the school campus and in the community. The School Advisory Council, community, and community business partners will be involved in collecting rewards, use of school funds, and outreach for an incentive system.

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.

The main goal is to develop and foster an interactive and reciprocal positive relationship among stakeholders and the south east Volusia community at large. Communication of positive reports for the three cities' commissions to share positive campus activities. Providing local traditional print media with information on getting involved in and current positive activities happening within the school. The streamlining and more frequent outreach on social media through a specific social media point person on campus to showcase our campus. Honorary Stingray for a Day to invite a major local figure to the campus to be a part of positive activities on campus. Our school would also like to create a key group of student leaders to help bring positive activities to local businesses, events, and feeder elementary schools. In conjunction with FFA our school will develop and create a plan to begin a community garden on campus.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00