Campbell Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Campbell Middle School

625 S KEECH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Matthews

Start Date for this Principal: 11/15/2019

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Campbell Middle School

625 S KEECH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/campbell/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	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Campbell Middle School will provide students with an education that recognizes their uniqueness, enhances their self-esteem, confidence, and prepares for college and/or career experiences as productive, responsible citizens, while ensuring a safe environment conducive to learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Campbell Middle School will create a school-wide culture and climate, conducive to academic success and student achievement.

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
Rorinson, Cameron	Principal	
Bryer, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Assistant Principal
Voges, Robert	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant Principal
Leonard, Nicole	Assistant Principal	ESE Assistant Principal
Wallace, Keisha	Instructional Coach	instructional Coach-Math
Geiger, Steven	Teacher, K-12	Academic Intervention
Mills, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Dalia, Kaitlin	Instructional Coach	
Gattis, LeRoy	Teacher, ESE	
McKee, Carissa	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Brown, Ariel	Teacher, K-12	
Kalis, Dan	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 11/15/2019, Kimberly Matthews

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
59

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	289	266	241	0	0	0	0	796
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	78	59	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	107	70	0	0	0	0	217
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	4	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	26	4	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	97	79	0	0	0	0	258
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	85	97	0	0	0	0	294

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	114	99	0	0	0	0	300

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	367	290	280	0	0	0	0	937
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	42	30	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	22	22	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	142	166	0	0	0	0	506

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	92	41	34	0	0	0	0	167

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	7	3	9	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	0	0	0	0	20

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	367	290	280	0	0	0	0	937
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	42	30	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	22	22	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	142	166	0	0	0	0	506

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	92	41	34	0	0	0	0	167

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	7	3	9	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	0	0	0	0	20

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	32%	51%	54%	32%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	51%	54%	50%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	42%	47%	45%	40%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	28%	54%	58%	31%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	36%	51%	57%	43%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	42%	51%	44%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	58%	51%	32%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	71%	72%	71%	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	32%	50%	-18%	54%	-22%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	27%	47%	-20%	52%	-25%
	2018	26%	47%	-21%	51%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	33%	50%	-17%	56%	-23%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	58%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	27%	48%	-21%	55%	-28%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	22%	47%	-25%	54%	-32%
	2018	17%	44%	-27%	54%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
08	2019	15%	29%	-14%	46%	-31%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	25%	37%	-12%	45%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	31%	57%	-26%	48%	-17%
	2018	33%	60%	-27%	50%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	60%	68%	-8%	71%	-11%
2018	57%	66%	-9%	71%	-14%
Compare	3%				
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	82%	54%	28%	61%	21%
2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
Compare	-6%				
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	92%	55%	37%	57%	35%
2018	78%	55%	23%	56%	22%
Compare	14%				

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	5	39	42	8	30	32	3	32			
ELL	28	55	64	12	17	8					
BLK	25	40	41	22	35	35	26	60	75		
HSP	39	54	53	32	33	17	36	58			
MUL	39	47		38	29			58			
WHT	52	57	57	46	47	57	70	77	83		
FRL	30	43	42	26	35	34	32	61	76		

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	8	36	43	6	30	34	6	28			
ELL	35	63	67	11	56	58					
BLK	27	42	45	27	38	36	29	53	76		
HSP	35	54	73	28	52	53	38	73			
MUL	48	63		42	55		40				
WHT	54	54	40	56	54	41	56	79	84		
FRL	33	46	47	32	43	39	34	59	73		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	6	37	42	5	32	37	9	42			
ELL	13	56		20	47						
BLK	25	47	45	27	40	40	22	70	80		
HSP	38	67	67	36	51		50	74	90		
MUL	28	35		24	22			54			
WHT	49	55	26	46	55	56	50	76	74		
FRL	30	49	45	29	41	44	27	71	76		

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
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	41
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	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	42
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.

Math / SWD
During the year this data was compiled, there was only one certified math teacher on campus; plethora of substitutes, limited support for SWDs, attempts at co-teaching failed, no math coach, novice teacher with limited knowledge of standard depth and breadth

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

Math Learning Gains declined 7 percentage points.
During the year this data was compiled, there was only one certified math teacher on campus; plethora of substitutes, limited support for SWDs, attempts at co-teaching failed, no math coach, novice teacher with limited knowledge of standard depth and breadth

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.

Math Achievement was 28% vs. 58% at the state level.
During the year this data was compiled, there was only one certified math teacher on campus; plethora of substitutes, limited support for SWDs, attempts at co-teaching failed, no math coach, novice teacher with limited knowledge of standard depth and breadth

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

Social Studies achievement grew to 63% from 61%
Teachers used PLC structure and district resources effectively and consistently.

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

There are 301 students with two or more indicators representing 38% of our population. Two additional areas of concern directly related to multiple indicators are students earning a 1 in math (37%) and students earning a 1 in ELA (32%). a solid one-third of our students struggle academically.

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

1. Mathematics Achievement
2. Students with Disabilities
3. ELL Students
4. Literacy - ELL
5. Create a respectful and positive community of learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Campbell has had a history of a high number of in and out of school suspensions as well as chronic behavior issues on campus. There have been multiple attempts to control with few attempts at building a structure (community) for learning. There is a strong relationship between attendance, behavior, and academics. The school has made attempts at following PBIS and Restorative Practice protocols, but buy-in has been nearly non-existent. Our current focus will be on people, not programs, and building relationships of trust and respect.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduced Suspensions Reduced Referral Incidents Increase Student Attendance Increased Teacher Attendance
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuation of the House System and expansion to student body.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It works. Peer schools in the district and across the nation are experiencing enhanced academic performance by focusing on a culture for learning that attends to the SEL needs of all involved. . Hattie and Quaglia have volumes of research supporting the importance of student belonging & aspirations and need for impactful relationships at school. Teacher-Student Relations e = .51; Positive Self-Concept e = ..41; Self-efficacy e = .92 #maslowB4bloom

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership will model for other adults and students: Hot Dogs & Nachos, House System, CMS Swag, deliberate trust building and empowerment of adults and students.

Person Responsible	Cameron Rorinson (clrobinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continuation of PBIS and/or BLT initiatives through House System

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Student Voice will be incorporated in all planning and decision making. Development of a functioning SGA with class to accompany.

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Proper use of "time-out" and "chill drill" and new ISS to curtail suspension and reduce loss of academic learning.

Person Responsible	Cameron Rorinson (clrobinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over 1/3 of our students are level 1 on FSA Math and school math performance continues to decline.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase in DIA scores Increase in FSA Math Increase in student grades
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Geiger (svgeiger@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intervention teachers and small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	.49 effect size for teacher led small group instruction according to Hattie's Visible Learning research.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue data-based work of Math Coach and Instructional Staff utilizing PLC's.

Person Responsible	Keisha Wallace (klwallac@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Budget will include personnel focused on math intervention, especially 6th grade.

Person Responsible	Cameron Rorinson (clrobinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data driven instruction and assessment-capable stakeholders.

Person Responsible	Steven Geiger (svgeiger@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Master Schedule built to support all learners with emphasis on properly placed students and supports.

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor small group instruction, intervention, and data-driven instruction through learning walks and observations.

Person Responsible	Cameron Rorinson (clrobinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD represent over 30% of our population and their subgroup data shows declining performance and a widening gap.There are also concerns about proper placement and accommodations for SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Improvement in SWD Academic scores and FSA scores. Reduced FTE exceptions
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Leonard (nlleonar@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Re-focus on ESE best-practices including compliance, master scheduling of SWD, and adequate and appropriate support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It works.

Action Steps to Implement

Master Schedule built with needs of SWD first. Appropriate support and ESE classes on master schedule.

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Dedicated ESE Administrator, adequate ESE staffing, and Student Services area.

Person Responsible	Cameron Rorinson (clrobinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Wednesday - Collective and deliberate effort to remediate and support struggling SWD.

Person Responsible	Nicole Leonard (nlleonar@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.

In addition to Students with Disabilities, we will enhance support for African American and ELL Students. All subgroups, of which African Americans are the largest, will benefit from our priority focus on mathematics instruction. We are also working with the midtown community and community groups to provide opportunitites for our African American students: DREAM, ATI, YAYA, Girls Who Code, FBLA, Robotics, Campbell Nights Alive
We have committed a teaching unit to ELL, allowing for 3 sections of DLA Reading (2 blocked and 1 single), and 2 periods of consultation and planning for ELL.

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.

Under new leadership, our team is addressing school culture by tapping into the voices of all stakeholders beginning with students. We are also addressing the social-emotional needs of stakeholders and enhancing the sense of community on campus. We are also implementing the house system for faculty and students. In addition to re-activating our PBIS initiatives, leadership has designed a menu of clubs and extra-curricular activities to engage students on the school community. We have also begun "Hot dogs & Nachos" and informal gatherings for teachers to share best practices and get to know one another.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00