

Volusia County Schools

New Smyrna Beach High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

New Smyrna Beach High School

1015 10TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://www.nsbhigh.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Timothy Merrick

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

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)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	N/A
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

New Smyrna Beach High School

1015 10TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://www.nsbhigh.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

If NSBHS implements social and academic supports for equitable, ambitious standards-based learning through collective efficacy, then students' at-risk factors will decrease, and academic achievement will increase.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together, We Are Stronger

Barracuda Strong

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
Woodard, Paul	Teacher, K-12	History Teacher/Department Chair
Croak, Deborah	Other	TOA - Testing, Graduation Assurance and SAC Chair
Zona, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Science teacher, SAC member
Meehl, Linda	Teacher, K-12	English teacher, Department Chair
Hopkins, Eleeta	Assistant Principal	ESE Assistant Principal
Stach, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Data Assistant Principal
Johnson, Jewel	School Counselor	Counseling Director/AICE Counseling Director
Merrick, Timothy	Principal	Principal
Everidge, Erin	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, Graduation Assurance Team, ESOL Coordinator
Fuhr, Geraldine	Dean	Discipline TOA, Peer Mediation Mentor
Springer, Lauri	Teacher, K-12	Math teacher, PLC Leader
Hughes, Gabriele	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Levine, Jeff	Teacher, ESE	IEP Facilitator
Heath, Raquel	School Counselor	Counselor - 11th grade
White, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher/SGA sponsor
Cromer, Kristina	Assistant Principal	Curriculum AP

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Timothy Merrick

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

100

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)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	N/A
* 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	506	426	442	366	1740
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	69	30	33	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	73	60	35	258
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	43	27	13	110
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	45	20	24	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	112	74	49	340
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	71	41	35	229

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	109	124	63	47	343

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	34	39	21	1	95
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	35	21	9	80

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

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	542	533	452	364	1891
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	61	51	66	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	14	5	7	56
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	198	132	91	41	462

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	77	59	48	38	222

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	104	59	39	20	222
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	8	3	0	42

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	542	533	452	364	1891
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	61	51	66	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	14	5	7	56
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	198	132	91	41	462

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	77	59	48	38	222

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	104	59	39	20	222
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	8	3	0	42

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	51%	52%	56%	53%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	49%	51%	49%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	37%	42%	35%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	49%	48%	51%	50%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	49%	48%	40%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	38%	45%	29%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	76%	68%	81%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	69%	73%	74%	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	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
	2018	52%	50%	2%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	50%	5%	53%	2%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	72%	12%	67%	17%
2018	77%	65%	12%	65%	12%
Compare		7%			

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	75%	63%	12%	70%	5%
2018	70%	63%	7%	68%	2%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	54%	-11%	61%	-18%
2018	42%	57%	-15%	62%	-20%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
2018	50%	55%	-5%	56%	-6%
Compare		4%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	42	41	24	59	47	63	46		61	7
ASN	55	36									
BLK	23	30	31	29	55	50	60	44		77	25
HSP	39	45	25	32	42		80	61		75	67
MUL	57	62		69	36		100	90		81	44
WHT	55	50	45	52	55	33	86	80		75	54
FRL	42	43	41	43	50	36	77	70		68	40
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	19	31	28	27	57		40	50		62	22
BLK	16	34	31	31	52		48	32		78	28
HSP	45	38	27	37	53		67	84		81	47
MUL	65	55		35	44	40	82	60		84	50
WHT	57	52	47	56	58	41	84	74		78	60
FRL	46	46	41	46	53	39	73	65		70	47
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	17	32	30	28	34	38	50	55		60	21
ASN	50	40		45	27						

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
BLK	25	41	45	24	40	35	41	39		73	31
HSP	53	54	30	58	53		84	80		84	44
MUL	54	48		40	41		80	50		91	48
WHT	55	50	35	52	39	29	83	79		76	53
FRL	45	45	32	44	40	31	76	66		70	42

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	46
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	67
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	59
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	51
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.

ELA achievement in our SWD ESSA subgroup showed the lowest performance. Our achievement level score for this subgroup remained the same for 2018 and 2019. Although this group's learning gains and L25% scores increased from 2018 to 2019, we clearly have some work to do in the overall achievement level score. We changed to a support facilitated model last year, which we hope will impact overall scores.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was our 9th grade ELA. They went from 52% in 2018 to 47% in 2019. It was a different group of students, however, we did experience some staffing issues. We had a permanent sub for our Eng 1 classes for the first 9 weeks. In addition, we lost a reading teacher mid-year and also had to use a sub for an extended period of time.

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.

Our math component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. (49% vs. 51%) Drilling down further, our math lowest 25th% had the largest gap compared to the state average. (36% vs. 45%) The loss of a math teacher factored into this. In addition, many student who come to us from middle school have yet to meet the EOC passing score for Alg.1. These students don't perform as well since the information isn't quite as fresh in their minds.

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

Our Science and Social Studies components showed the most improvement in each of the subgroups from 2018 to 2019. Those departments meet as a PLC to collaborate and plan with each other. Science also offers boot camps each year for their students. Teachers focused on all level 2 students and offered extra tutoring bootcamps.

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

Attendance and referrals, particularly our freshman and sophomore class.

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

1. ELA and Math achievement for SWD subgroup
2. ELA and Math achievement for Black/African subgroup
3. Dealing with Covid slide and other related issues that could impact student achievement and teacher morale
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will be focusing on the ESSA subgroup, SWD Math and ELA achievement as they were the grade components that had the lowest % scores. The subgroup federal index percentile is right at 41%. Working on Math and ELA achievement will help improve learning gains and lower quartile scores.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase SWD ELA achievement from 19% to 41%. Learning gains and lower quartile scores increased from 2018 to 2019, but we will continue to focus on improving these scores to help us raise our ELA achievement score. Our goal is to maintain or increase the current 41% subgroup federal index score. We also hope to increase SWD Math achievement from 24% to 41%. That score decreased from 29% in 2018 to 24% in 2019.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Timothy Merrick (trmerric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will be using meaningful feedback as the evidence-based strategy for this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie's study on the influences and effect sizes related to school achievement, meaningful feedback can greatly enhance student learning and achievement. With an effect size of .73, feedback is almost double that of the hinge point .4, making it an effective instructional strategy that is applicable across disciplines and grades.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify professional learning needs of teachers related to the evidenced-based strategy we will be implementing for this Area of Focus.

Person Responsible Kristina Cromer (klcromer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Plan and implement PD that will help teachers provide effective and meaningful feedback to their students.

Person Responsible Kristina Cromer (klcromer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Math and Literacy Coach will support teachers (modeling, lesson planning) They will encourage use of self-paced Edgenuity Alg.1 class and Algebra Nation.

Person Responsible Erin Everidge (eaeverid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continued use of weekly PLC meetings where teachers will continue to examine data from DIA and VLT to drive instruction and remediation plans. Continue office hours for students each morning.

Person Responsible Timothy Merrick (trmerric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue with ESE support facilitation model.

Person Responsible Eleeta Hopkins (eshopkin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide "Check and Connect" PD again this year. This strategy was successful for the group of teachers last year.

Person Responsible Jennifer Stach (jwstach@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Encourage use of office hours, on-line Alg 1 Edgenuity class and Algebra nation to help students struggling in Algebra 1.

Person Responsible Timothy Merrick (trmerric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will be focusing on the ESSA subgroup African-American ELA and Math achievement. Although this subgroup had an increase in ELA achievement from 16 in 2018 to 23 in 2019, learning gains declined from 34 to 30. The subgroup federal index score didn't fall below 41%, but choosing it as an area of focus will help ensure it stays or increases next year.

Measurable Outcome: Increase African-American ELA achievement from 23 to 41. Focusing on learning gains and lower quartile will help the overall score. Increase African-American Math achievement from 29 to 41. Again, focusing on this group's lower quartile and learning gains will help impact the overall achievement level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Timothy Merrick (trmerric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Meaningful feedback to students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie's study on the influences and effect sizes related to school achievement, meaningful feedback can greatly enhance student learning and achievement. With an effect size of .73, feedback is almost double that of the hinge point .4, making it an effective instructional strategy that is applicable across disciplines and grades.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify professional learning needs of teachers related to the evidenced-based strategy we will be implementing for this Area of Focus. Provide PD throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Kristina Cromer (klcromer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Math and Literacy Coach support for modeling lessons using meaningful feedback. Literacy Coach will provide strategies to improve math vocabulary instruction. Math Coach will support teachers with researched based tips for providing types of feedback. The math coach will gather data for each PLC when strategies for instruction and remediation will be discussed.

Person Responsible: Gabriele Hughes (ghughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Promote self-paced Alg 1 course on Edgenuity as well as Algebra Nation.

Person Responsible: Gabriele Hughes (ghughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create boot camp for identified Alg. 1 students who need to pass the Alg. 1 EOC.

Person Responsible: Gabriele Hughes (ghughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue use of "Check and Connect" strategy used last year. Provide additional PD for teachers who would like to implement.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Stach (jwstach@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will be focusing on the social and emotional learning for our students who have been out of school since March 2020. With no current testing data to review, we anticipate the Covid slide. On-line learning wasn't a perfect fit for all students. We will have many students who will require extra support, not only academically, but socially and emotionally as well.

Measurable Outcome: Through SEL strategies, we hope to impact our overall referral rates for our freshman students. Traditionally, they receive the highest number of referrals for the school year. Because our data for the 2019-2020 school year isn't based on a full year, we took the 9th grade referral data for the last 3 years to arrive at an average of 1868. We hope to reduce that by 10% to 1682 for the entire school year. Using SEL strategies will provide teachers and students with tools to manage and understand emotions that often lead to behavior problems.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Timothy Merrick (trmerric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: SEL strategies. Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that SEL not only improves achievement by an average of 11 percentile points, but it also increases prosocial behaviors (such as kindness, sharing, and empathy), improves student attitudes toward school, and reduces depression and stress among students (Durlak et al., 2011). Effective social and emotional learning programming involves coordinated classroom, schoolwide, family, and community practices that help students develop the following five key skills: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills and Responsible Decision Making.

Action Steps to Implement

Offer SEL PD and encourage teachers to use SEL strategies such as cooperative learning, cultivating self awareness and kindness.

Person Responsible: Jewel Johnson (jljohnso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor referral data quarterly

Person Responsible: Timothy Merrick (trmerric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Establish a peer mediation group

Person Responsible: Geraldine Fuhr (fuhr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Restorative Practices PD and implementation of restorative practices to address behavior problems. Will also offer a book study (Hacking School Discipline: 9 Ways to Create a Culture of Empathy and Responsibility Using Restorative Justice by Brad Weinstein and Nathan Maynard) for teachers hat ties meaningful feedback with SEL strategies.

Person Responsible: Erin Everidge (eaeverid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Non-Punitive Discipline Strategy with referrals

Person Responsible Timothy Merrick (trmerric@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.

We will continue to address school safety and security, one of the most important parts of any plan for school improvement. Our goal remains to provide students with a safe and secure learning environment. We will continue to improve awareness related to school safety and security and maintain best practices. Our front gate will remain manned during the school day, points of entry have been reduced and additional stairwells have been added to enhance student travel through out the day. In addition, our SRO has been assigned full time and safety class has been installed at the front desk. Doors have also been installed that require granted access to the main building. Masks are required and all students, staff and visitors will have temperature taken to gain entry to campus. Procedures have been established to follow regarding potential Covid cases. The dress code and wearing of student and faculty ID will also be monitored.

All professional development will align with our school's focus areas in the SIP. (Differentiation, Restorative Practices, Gradual Release, Support Facilitation Model, SEL strategies)

We now have a certified teacher in our in-school suspension room which will assist with continuity of instruction. These students will lose less instructional time due to being out of the classroom.

We will continue to work on attendance issues through home visits, use of the Check and Connect strategy and increased teacher interventions.

Teachers will be encouraged to have quarterly meetings with students who receive a D or F in their class. They will work on remediation action plans, encourage office hours and monitor attendance.

Our Math and Literacy Coach will continue to support all content areas using learning walks and modeling of lessons.

Teachers will continue weekly PLC meetings where they will be encouraged to review School City data. They will discuss and implement strategies in their classrooms based on this data. PLC groups will be strongly encouraged to focus on the identified ESSA subgroups in the SIP. Our Science and Social Studies PLC will share strategies they use that result in strong assessment data results.

Teachers have taken PD for the new School City platform, a comprehensive assessment, analysis, and reporting system. This data will help drive effective instruction in classrooms.

Continue with the supplemented 8th period credit retrieval strategy where instructor provides students math instruction and credit retrieval opportunities so students can meet graduation requirements.

Office Hours are offered each morning from 8:05 to 8:30. Students will be encouraged to use this opportunity for remediation.

USA Test Prep will be available for FSA ELA, Algebra 1, PERT, ACT and SAT. Students can use for remediation and teachers can use the data to refine and reteach concepts in the classroom.

The CTE facilitator will continue to work with our students entering the workforce after high school, providing them opportunities to tour local industries, job shadow and resume building. Her work space showcases job opportunities and information. In addition, the facilitator will also work with community mentors who would like to work with out at-risk students.

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.

One of the areas of focus we chose to include in our SIP is Culture and Environment as it relates to Social and Emotional Learning. Understanding the impact of how the pandemic has impacted our students and staff, our goal is to use SEL strategies throughout the year to help maintain a positive school culture and environment.

Our school leadership team, consisting of teachers, administration guidance were all involved in establishing the areas of focus and action steps for our current School Improvement Plan. Every teacher and administrator on campus as well community stakeholders have a role to play in helping us meet the goals outlined in the plan. The plan will be presented to teachers, SAC and posted on our website so all of the stakeholders in our community are aware of what our school is trying to accomplish. The plan remains fluid throughout the year so we can change or implement new strategies as needed to help us meet our goals.

We plan to introduce several behavioral initiative this year. A Peer Remediation group will be established to motivate students to resolve their conflicts collaboratively. Peer mediation motivates students to talk things out rather than fight things out. This strategy will not only build a positive school culture and environment, but involve students, who are important stakeholders. This strategy will also help students develop socially and emotionally, where their strengths and values are recognized.

We also plan to implement a a non-punitive disciple approach this year to enhance the school climate. Using Restorative Practices techniques that focus on repairing relationships, alternatives to punitive discipline will be used to help build healthier relationships with students.

Our school is committed to building a positive school culture this year. We are working on building effective communication so that every stakeholder is aware of what we are trying to accomplish at NSBHS. We will continue to be aware of the individual needs of our students, faculty and staff. Incorporating SEL strategies is not only beneficial for students' emotional health but also their academic achievement. Our behavioral initiatives will help enhance self esteem and foster respect for diversity as well.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00