Richard Milburn Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Richard Milburn Academy

1031 MASON AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

http://rmaflorida.org/

Demographics

Principal: Artherly Sands S

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2003

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	CS&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

Richard Milburn Academy

1031 MASON AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

http://rmaflorida.org/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2010-11
Grade				

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.

The mission of Richard Milburn Academy High School is to create and enhance educational opportunity and performance for all student populations that we serve; to deliver educational services through talented employees who value the dignity and ability of each student.

We help students to achieve!

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Richard Milburn Academy is that teachers and staff work hard to provide the best educational experience for our students. Parental partnership is a high priority and is essential for students' success.

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
Sands, Art	Principal	1. New hires are provided with developmental support by their site-based instructional coach, leadership team's members, and administrators through weekly and monthly meetings and targeted feedback. 2. On-going professional development training and PLC meetings are conducted to address areas of classroom management, instructional practices, learning standards, curriculum, reading and testing strategies, academic skill building, data analysis, testing review, preparation, and practice sessions, remediation, tutoring, cross-curriculum and common planning, instruction, assessments, and learning activities, and other academic related topics. 3. Leadership team's members hold celebrations for staff to support and develop teamwork (e.g. luncheons, teachers' appreciation events, personal thank you notes, and other forms of recognition). 4. We also involve teachers in the decision making process by asking for their input and feedback (e.g. at staff and PLC meetings, training sessions, and surveys).
Drewes, Margaret	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach - coaching, training, and mentoring teachers regarding curriculum, testing, academic goals, students' gains and progress, learning, testing, and reading strategies, methods, resources, materials, remediation, and other academic items in-person and on-line.
Johns, Richard	Teacher, K-12	Science Instructor
Prince, Heather	School Counselor	Counseling and students' courses, credits, and graduation requirements and plans
Woods Jenkins, Latiffany	Administrative Support	Campus Adviser - students' discipline issues and other campus functions
Wyatt, Veronica	Teacher, K-12	Science Instructor
Bryant, Tony	Teacher, K-12	Math Instructor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/23/2003, Artherly Sands S

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	51	164	357
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	48	40	127	274
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	10	10	66
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	8	19	9	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	4	11	5	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	44	32	102	229
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	34	15	42	135

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	50	36	101	250

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	23	19	21	95
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	20	54	125

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	6	19	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4	9	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	14	23	12	15	64

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	39	20	63	153
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	6	19	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4	9	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	14	23	12	15	64

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	39	20	63	153
Students retained two or more times	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	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	51%	0%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	37%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	48%	51%	0%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	48%	0%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	38%	45%	0%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	76%	68%	0%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	73%	0%	68%	70%

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	10%	51%	-41%	55%	-45%
	2018	21%	50%	-29%	53%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	8%	50%	-42%	53%	-45%
	2018	8%	49%	-41%	53%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	16%	72%	-56%	67%	-51%
2018	5%	65%	-60%	65%	-60%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		11%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	11%	63%	-52%	70%	-59%
2018	17%	63%	-46%	68%	-51%
Compare		-6%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	6%	54%	-48%	61%	-55%
2018	14%	57%	-43%	62%	-48%
Compare		-8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	3%	55%	-52%	57%	-54%
2018	3%	55%	-52%	56%	-53%
Compare		0%			

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		27						5		38	
BLK		20					9	4		18	
HSP										14	
WHT	7	20		12			9	16		14	
FRL	5	22		7	8		15	10		15	
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

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	9
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	69
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	64%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
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	
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	
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	7
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	14
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	13
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	10
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Biology EOC: +11% (compare: 16% 2019 from 5% 2018)

*ELA FSA , Grade 9: -11% (21% in 2018 to 11% in 2019; same grade comparison from 2018 to 2019)

Grade 10: same at 8%(-13% cohort comparison from 2018 to 2019)

*U.S. History EOC: -6% (compare: 17% in 2018 to 11% 2019)

Level 1: (average score; %=correct responses)
1860-1910 24%
Global Military; Political; Economic Challenges (1890-1940) 22%
U.S.; Defense of the International Peace (1940-2010) 53%

Level 1 students scored higher when answering questions from the 1940-2010 section and less questions answered correctly in the 1960-1910 and 1890-1940.

Level 2:
1860-1910 35%
Global Military, Political, and Economic Challenges (1890-1940) 33%
U.S.; Defense of the International Peace (1940-2010) 41%

Level 2 students had the highest amount of correct answers for the 1940-2010 time period; and, less amounts of correct responses for the 1860-1910 and 1890-1940 questions.

Geometry EOC's - same at 3% (0% compare from 2018 to 2019)

*Algebra I EOC's: -8% (compare: 14% 2018 to 6% in 2019)

Level 1: (average scores; % = correct responses)
Algebra; Modeling: 21%
Functions; Modeling: 7%
Statistics; Number System:18%
Level 1 students scored the lowest in functions and modeling and statistics and the number system; and, the highest scores in the algebra and modeling questions.

Level 2:
Algebra; Modeling: 33%
Functions; Modeling: 22%
Statistics; Number System: 1%
Level 2 students had the lowest score on statistics and the number system; highest score on algebra and modeling than functions and modeling questions.

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

ELA FSA, 9th Grade: -11% (21% in 2018 to 11% in 2019; same grade comparison from 2018 to 2019)

Level 1: (average scores; % = correct responses)
19 % Key ideas; Details
31% Craft; Structure
20% Integration of knowledge; Ideas
57% Language; Editing
20% Text-Based Writing

Students had low scores in all five skill areas with strongest skill areas were language and editing;

and, craft and structure; and, weakest skill areas were key ideas and details, integration of knowledge and ideas, and text-based writing.

Level 2:
31% Key ideas; Details
38% Craft; Structure
27% Integration of knowledge; Ideas
71% Language; Editing
60% Text-Based Writing

Students scored the lowest in integration of knowledge and ideas, key ideas and details, and craft and structure; and, the stronger skill areas were text-based writing and language and editing.

10th grade Level 1:
20% Key ideas; Details
27% Craft; Structure
20% Integration of knowledge; Ideas
43% Language; Editing
40% Text-Based Writing

Students scored low in 5 areas. Their higher scores were in language and editing and text-based writing; and, their lower scores were in key ideas and details, integration of knowledge and ideas, and craft and structure.

Level 2:
47% Key ideas; Details
50% Craft; Structure
60% Integration of knowledge; Ideas
71% Language; Editing
60% Text-Based Writing

Students had low scores in all 5 areas; however, they answered correctly the most questions in language and editing.

** Please see Part a for Algebra I EOC: -8% and U.S. History EOC: -6% for 2019.

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.

ELA FSA, 9th Grade: -45% (2019 compared with state average)
ELA FSA, 10th Grade: -45% (2019 compared with state average)
Algebra I, EOC: -55% (2019 compared with state average)
Geometery, EOC: -54% (2019 compared with state average)*
U.S. History, EOC: -59% (2019 compared with state average)
Biology, EOC:-51% (2019 compared with state average)

*Geometry
Level 1 (average scores; % = correct responses)
15% congruency, similarity, right triangles, and Trigonometry
36% geometric measurement, and geometric properties with equations
11% modeling with geometry (11%)
These students did not pass the EOC Geometry test. They had the lowest scores for the congruency and modeling with geometry sections; and, they answered the most amount of questions correctly in

the measurement section of this test.

Level 2
33% congruency, similarity, right triangles, and Trigonometry
11% circles, geometric measurement, and geometric properties with equations
22% modeling with geometry

Students had the lowest scores in modeling with geometry and measurement; and, they answered the most questions correctly for congruency questions.

Our students will attend and participate in all classes, labs, after school small group and individual tutoring, in-class remediation, and in-school boot camps to increase their academic skills, content knowledge, retention in all subject areas, comprehension, writing ability, critical thinking, and test scores.

Our teachers will effectively instruct, motivate, engage, and guide their students with learning standards and data based curriculum, assignments, learning strategies, test practice, and assessments in order to close these learning gaps, reduce academic skill deficiencies, and promote academic success and higher test scores.

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

Biology EOC: +11% (compare: 16% 2019 from 5% 2018)

The science teachers created class assignment, review, and assessment questions and content)EOC units: e.g. molecular and cellular biology; classification, heredity, and evolution, and organisms, populations, and ecosystems) in EOC format and higher order of thinking levels (level 2 and 3 questioning with consistent academic and scientific language, terms, diagrams, charts, graphs, tables, and other text features). The science teachers implemented these high level of questions and detailed unit content daily with their students. The science teachers explained, reviewed, challenged, and drilled their students with each science topic, related statistics, text features, and test question in order for these students to understand and apply the scientific terms and academic language in all questions within a unit and during test review and practice sessions. The science teachers also presented science topics with detailed visuals, text features, videos, notes, and Power Point presentations to their students. The science teachers also used a variety of websites and electronic sources for students to complete their assignments, research, projects, test review and preparations, and assessments with study.com, Nearpod, Kahoot!, and the subject areas' textbook websites.

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

9th Grade
Level 1 of 2019 Statewide ELA 51 of 73 students failed ELA FSA Test
Level 1 of 2029 Statewide Math 44 of 73 students failed ELA FSA Test
59 out of 73 below 90% Attendance

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

1. Algebra I and Geometry EOC scores to increase by 3%.
2. ELA/Reading FSA scores to increase by 3%.
3. Graduation rate to increase by 5%.
4. Regular (daily) attendance to average at 70%.
5. Percentage of students taking standardized testing increase to 90%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Data for the following subgroups: White, Black, Hispanic are below 41%. The teachers and academic team will be collaborating, discussing, analyzing, creating, monitoring, reviewing, revising, and adjusting learning, reading, and testing strategies, instructional methods, remediation, curriculum, learning activities, assignments, assessments, content review sessions, and test preparation and practice sessions as needed based upon the students' progress, data base skill areas, learning standards, curriculum guides, tests results and levels, students' specific needs and accommodations (e.g. ESE I.E.P.'s, 504's, and ELL learning plans) in order to ensure students' learning gains for reading and academic skills, increased test scores, content retention, general knowledge, and overall progress, grades, and credits completed.
Measurable Outcome:	The students' performance for ELA FSA tests' scores and academic skill gains will increase by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Margaret Drewes (mmdrewes@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA/Reading and writing strategies with SQ3R's (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review, Kuijk, 2017; Artis, 2008,; and Robinson, 1970); and, other multi-step strategies for: predicting, drawing inferences, questioning, summarizing and annotating, finding main ideas and key details with text-based evidence, using KWL, graphic organizers, and graphic organizers, synthesizing, and using context clues, etc. (Beers et. al., 2003; Zwiers et.al., 2011; Kruse, 2020, Edutopia.org, 2020).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These reading, learning, and testing strategies will assist and guide our students to read more effectively and accurately by improving their overall reading comprehension, Lexile reading levels and scores, writing abilities, annotating and summarizing skills and abilities, fluency, vocabulary, general knowledge, literacy, literature background, critical thinking, responding to advance level of questioning, deductive reasoning, drawing inferences, finding main ideas and key details with text-based evidence, determining cause and effect, identifying sequencing of events, applying context clues, interpreting text features, determining craft and structure, determining point of view, central idea, claims, reasons, conflicts, irony, figurative language, and elements of fiction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELA/Reading teachers and other academic team members will implement reading, writing, and testing interventions (e.g. Read 180, Achieve 3000, myhrw.com, School City, study.com, Nearpod, Canvas, and Kahoot!), strategies, and differentiated instruction to promote students' reading comprehension, overall literacy, writing, learning gains, and FSA's scores.
2. ELA/Reading teachers will tutor all students and add academic skill building, test review, preparation, and practice boot camps, which include all students with specific learning needs and accommodations (e.g. ESE, 504's, and ELL's).
3. ELA/Reading teachers will participate in PD training and meetings: PLC, SLT, SIP, data chats, Project 10, graduation plans, ESE's I.E.P's, and ELL's Reviews..
4. At PLC meetings and data conferences, ELA/Reading teachers will create, discuss, analyze, monitor, and revise lessons, learning activities, assignments, and assessments to ensure effective and learning standard and data base instruction in order to close learning gaps, increase all academic skills, and test scores.
5. Instructional coaching sessions combined with steps #'s 1-4.

Person Responsible	Margaret Drewes (mmdrewes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Data for the following subgroups: White, Black, and Hispanic are below 41%. The math teachers and the academic team will collaborate, design, analyze, and revise effect instruction, learning activities, math problem solving strategies, remediation, assessments, and testing review, preparation, and practice to engage, encourage, and challenge our students; so that, they can improve their problem solving skills, accuracy in calculations, applying formulas and theorems, interpreting and extrapolating statistics, graphs, charts, and tables, and overall retention and learning gains for all mathematical skill areas and levels of questioning in EOC formats. The math teachers and other members of the academic team will include all students' specific learning needs and accommodations (e.g. ESE's I.E.P.'s, 504's, and ELL students' learning plans) during all instruction, learning activities, remediation sessions, assessments, and test preparation and practice sessions.
Measurable Outcome:	Students' performance for test scores and academic skill areas on math EOC's for Algebra I and Geometry will increase by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Bryant (tlbryant@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math problem solving strategies: F.A.S.T. Draw (Find, Ask, Set, Tie, Discuss, Read, Answer, and Write, Tok & Keskin, 2012; Mercer & Miller, 1997; and Cassel & Reod. 1996), R.I.D.E. (Remember, Identify, Determine, and Enter; Mercer et.al.., 2011; Locke, Rowan University, 2016), TINS (Thought, Information, Number Sentences, and Solution Sentences, Owens, 2003), STAR (Search, Translate, Answer, and Review, Peltier & Vannest, 2016), and Reciprocal Peer Tutoring (Fuchs, et.al., 2008).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These mathematical learning strategies will benefit our students by helping them to effectively and accurately solve word problems and equations with step-by-step and self-check methods in addition to increasing the accuracy of their calculations, applying formulas and theorems, and retention of mathematical content and terms. The math teachers and academic team will create, analyze, monitor, and adjust their instructions, learning activities, collaborative discussions, peer tutoring, assignments, drill and practice, remediation, and assessments based upon students' progress, test scores, data for skill based areas, learning standards, curriculum maps and guidelines, and EOC content, level of questioning, academic language.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math teachers and other academic team members will implement, instruct, and guide students with varied methods, assignments, assessments, and strategies to improve their reading, writing, critical thinking, and math problem solving skills, calculations, and accuracy.
2. The math teachers will remediate, tutor, and review with students during class, testing preparation and practice boot camps, and after school. Students will apply math problem solving strategies, formulas, terms, theorems, and steps. All students' specific learning needs and accommodations will be included (e.g. ESE, 504's, and ELL).
3. The math teachers will participate in PD training and meetings: PLCs, SLT, data chats, Project 10, graduation, ESE's I.E.P., 504's, and ELL's reviews.
4. During PLC meetings and data conferences, the math teachers will create, discuss, analyze, monitor, and revise lessons, labs, assignments, and assessments in align with EOC's skill areas and learning standards to improve students' math problem solving, calculating, learning gains, and EOC's test scores. The math teachers will research, utilize, and implements skill building assignments, problem solving assignments, word problems and equations, geometric proofs to solve, assessments, test review and practice for multi-level questions, resources, supplements, math problems and/or equations from Algebra

and Math Nation to instruct and prepare the students for the EOC's in algebra and geometry, which are aligned with the learning standards and curriculum maps and guidelines.
5. Instructional coaching sessions combined with steps #'s 1-4.

Person Responsible Tony Bryant (tlbryant@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Graduation Rate - ESSA Data for the following subgroups: White, Black, and Hispanic, are below 41%. The academic team will collaborate during SLT Team meetings, PLC meetings, and other faculty meetings in order to create and implement effective and common instruction, learning activities, assessments, skill building interventions, reading, learning, and testing strategies, and testing review, preparation, and practice sessions for all students to graduate and succeed in the work force, at college, at trade schools, and/or in the military branches. The academic teams will discuss, analyze, and monitor all students' testing data, academic skill areas, grades, credits, and overall progress to adjust any instruction, assignments, assessments, and remediation sessions to ensure the students' success and graduation requirements including ESE I.E.P., 504, and ELL students and their accommodations and specific learning needs. The academic team especially the school counselors will meet with the students on a regular basis re: graduate plans, academic and career goals, testing data, grades, and credits. The counselors will also hold graduation plan meetings with the students and parents through out the school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Students' performance (e.g. scores and academic skill areas' gains) on ELA FSA, Reading ACT, and math EOC's tests for Algebra I and Geometry will increase by 3%. Students will earn a GPA of 2.0 or better and complete 18 or 24 credits per their graduation plans. Therefore, graduation rate will increase 5% this school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Art Sands (assands@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA: SQ3R's (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review, Kuijk, 2017; Artis, 2008, Robinson, 1970); multi-steps: predicting, drawing inferences, questioning, summarizing and annotating; identifying key ideas and details with text-based evidence, using KWL, graphic organizers, and context clues (Beers et. al., 2003; Zwiers et.al., 2011; Kruse, 2020, Edutopia.org, 2020); Math problem solving: F.A.S.T. Draw (Find, Ask, Set, Tie, Discuss, Read, Answer, and Write, Tok & Keskin, 2012; Mercer & Miller, 1997; Cassel & Reod. 1996), R.I.D.E. (Remember, Identify, Determine, and Enter; Mercer et.al., 2011; Locke, Rowan University, 2016), TINS (Thought, Information, Number Sentences, and Solution Sentences, Owens, 2003), and STAR (Search, Translate, Answer, and Review, Peltier & Vannest, 2016); Reciprocal Peer Tutoring (Fuchs, et.al., 2008); Improve High School Graduation Rates, post secondary education, and careers; ROCI (Results Oriented Cycle of Inquiry): set goals, partner, plan, act, access, reflect, and adjust (Barbour, NC School Improvement Guide; Hanover Research District Administration Practice, 2014).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The teachers and other academic team members are using these reading, critical thinking, and math problem solving strategies to remediate, assist, and guide students to improve our students engagement, academic skills, content retention, general knowledge, reading comprehension, critical thinking, fluency, vocabulary, test scores, grades, credit completion, and overall G.P.A. As a result, they can graduate and attend post secondary education, trade programs, military training, and other job/career programs and internships.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and other academic team members will create, discuss, implement, analyze, and revise instruction, assignments, assessments, strategies, remediation, tutoring, and testing boot camps to improve all students' graduation rates, learning gains, and test scores (e.g. FSA's, EOC's, and ACT's).
2. The teachers and other academic team members will participate in PD training, PLC meetings, and data chats re: effective and common instruction and assessments aligned with data based skill areas,

learning standards, curriculum guidelines, cross-curriculum, and ESE, 504's, and ELL students' specific learning needs and accommodations.

3. School counselors will conduct graduation plan meetings with students, families, and academic team re: career and educational goals, credits, G.P.A., and testing. They will host career days with the academic team, students, families, colleges, military recruiters, trade schools, and companies' H.R.'s..

4. SLT team will discuss, analyze, and monitor attendance, graduation plans, Project 10, ESE, 504, and ELL students.

5. Instructional coaching sessions combined with steps #'s 1-4.

Person Responsible   Margaret Drewes (mmdrewes@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.

The SLT Team will address and monitor the performance of 9th and 10th grade students on the ELA FSA and Math EOC tests and their attendance during weekly and monthly SLT meetings, PLC's meetings, and data chat and data analysis sessions with the teachers, learning specialists, and school counselors. The SLT team, the teachers, and other academic staff members will encourage and guide these students including ESE, 504, and ELL students to improve their attendance, academic skills, comprehension, critical thinking, math problem solving , content retention, general knowledge, and testing scores during class instruction, learning activities, assignments, projects, labs, reviews, test practice and preparation, after school tutoring, individual remediation sessions, and during academic and testing boot camp sessions.

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 parents, families, and community members are welcome to attend open houses, orientation, school and community events, honor ceremonies, career days, multi-cultural events and presentations, talent shows, graduation meetings, graduation ceremonies, parent education days, and board meetings. They answer surveys. The parents, students, and guardians are invited and participate in-person conferences, graduation plan meetings, and/or I.E.P., 504, and/or ESOL review learning plan meetings with the counselors and other academic team members throughout the year. They receive messages and information via ConnectEd, telephone calls, virtual video conferences, RMA and VCS websites, e-mails, newsletters, report cards, and midterm progress reports. Migrant and Homeless student outreach is made

available to students and their families. Other agencies and community programs are relayed to the students and their families via the school counselors such as SMA Behavioral, Inc. and Domestic Abuse Council. Clothing closets and food pantry are also provided to students and their families, which are referred by the school counselors.

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				$34,789.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		529-Technology-Related Textbooks	7891 - Richard Milburn Academy			$34,789.00
			Notes: HRW Collections textbook renewal for on-line textbook and resources, close read work books = $6,000 Read 180, renewal: = $5,800 Achieve 3000 = $21,989			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$30,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		520-Textbooks	7891 - Richard Milburn Academy			$30,000.00
			Notes: math, textbooks and on-line access science, textbooks and on-line access			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		529-Technology-Related Textbooks	7891 - Richard Milburn Academy			$7,500.00
			Notes: study.com			
					Total:	$72,289.00