Volusia County Schools

Holly Hill School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Voges J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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 (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/hollyhill/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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

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.

Holly Hill School is committed to empowering all students to become life-long learners and successful citizens through collaborative staff and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Holly Hill School, all students are empowered to become life-long learners through the interaction of all stakeholders that convey high expectations to students and one another.

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
Goropeuschek, Audrey	Dean	Student relations for elementary
Watson, Jason	Principal	Monitoring of school wide improvment plan.
Iannarelli, Heather	Assistant Principal	Monitor plan provide input.
Zablo, Michael	Assistant Principal	Monitor plan provide input.
Hanrahan, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Monitor plan provide input.
Brogan, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Monitor plan provide input. (Math)
Cone, Mallory	Other	Community liaison
Glaenzer, Stephanie	Other	SIG-Early Learning Specialist
Donald, Adrienne	SAC Member	Writing the school improvement plan
Mundrean, Paul	SAC Member	Writing the SIP
Henry, Derrick	Assistant Principal	
Butler, Jesika	Teacher, K-12	
Larry, Gardner	Teacher, K-12	
Stumpf, Josie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Robert Voges J

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
96

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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 (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	101	105	89	82	78	118	106	94	0	0	0	0	839
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	1	9	1	5	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	7	14	2	3	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	23	42	28	39	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	27	54	34	36	0	0	0	0	153

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	1	5	18	36	24	24	0	0	0	0	108

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

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	119	139	108	120	86	133	136	126	111	0	0	0	0	1078
Attendance below 90 percent	21	20	16	14	9	7	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	3	12	18	10	10	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	38	76	56	72	66	0	0	0	0	316

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	1	2	6	15	21	12	15	0	0	0	0	72

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	6	11	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	119	139	108	120	86	133	136	126	111	0	0	0	0	1078
Attendance below 90 percent	21	20	16	14	9	7	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	3	12	18	10	10	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	38	76	56	72	66	0	0	0	0	316

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	1	2	6	15	21	12	15	0	0	0	0	72

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	6	11	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	35%	54%	61%	36%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	53%	59%	46%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	44%	54%	36%	43%	51%
Math Achievement	34%	55%	62%	42%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	40%	52%	59%	48%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	45%	52%	39%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	61%	56%	42%	56%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	72%	78%	56%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	29%	58%	-29%	58%	-29%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
	2018	26%	51%	-25%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	30%	50%	-20%	54%	-24%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	28%	47%	-19%	52%	-24%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	35%	47%	-12%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	27%	50%	-23%	56%	-29%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	58%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	32%	60%	-28%	62%	-30%
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	59%	-26%	64%	-31%
	2018	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
	2018	44%	57%	-13%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	21%	48%	-27%	55%	-34%
	2018	23%	49%	-26%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
07	2019	23%	47%	-24%	54%	-31%
	2018	27%	44%	-17%	54%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	17%	29%	-12%	46%	-29%
	2018	17%	37%	-20%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	38%	57%	-19%	48%	-10%
	2018	42%	60%	-18%	50%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	47%	68%	-21%	71%	-24%
2018	51%	66%	-15%	71%	-20%
Compare		-4%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	54%	36%	61%	29%
2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Compare		21%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	13	26	28	11	27	27	17	12			
ELL	31	44	33	38	47	39	41				
BLK	23	37	32	19	29	31	32	47			
HSP	40	46	27	42	46	33	44				

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
MUL	47	46		57	62		45				
WHT	42	46	35	41	46	39	54	66	82		
FRL	34	43	31	33	39	36	45	53	84		

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	7	33	35	10	32	38	14	6			
ELL	30	41	64	38	31	42	27				
BLK	25	38	40	29	40	42	35	46			
HSP	41	46	63	40	42	38	57	69			
MUL	43	42		34	33		33				
WHT	38	44	44	43	48	47	44	61	52		
FRL	33	41	44	36	43	43	40	59	67		

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	26	25	12	34	37	10	13			
ELL	29	44	29	44	55	55	40				
BLK	23	39	28	31	43	34	27	55			
HSP	42	52	38	51	52	50	45				
MUL	45	48		53	55						
WHT	42	49	38	45	49	36	49	54	67		
FRL	34	45	35	41	48	39	40	54	56		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	51
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	50
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	45
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 35% Lowest Quartile at 32% which was a 12% decrease
• Math 34% Lowest Quartile at 36% which was a 7% decrease
• Science 44% below district and state
• ESSA subgroups Black 31% and SWD 20%
Contributing Factors:
• Lack of foundational skills
• Need for increased small group instruction

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

• ELA learning gains the lowest quartile 32% dropped 12%
• ELA lowest quartile ELL and Hispanic subgroups dropped over 30%
Contributing Factors:
• The ELL population continues to increase
• Need to allocate resources to meet the needs of the students

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.

State Math gaps 19%-34%
Contributing Factors:
• Lack of foundational skills
• Need to increase small group instruction

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

• Middle School Acceleration due to increasing in Algebra scores
Contributing Factors:
• Tutoring

• Saturday Boot Camp
• Small group instruction

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

• Attendance concerns from K-8th grade
• Grades fourth- eighth Level 1's on the state assessment

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

Increase the lowest quartile in Math
Increase the lowest quartile in ELA
Increase Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the math performance from the school report card 2018-2019, FSA Math LQLG decreased from 43% to 36%. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math's lowest quartile in order to improve math learning gains and overall proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the lowest quartile learning gains in Math to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Plan, implement and monitor teacher-lead, small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"Small-Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. Small group instruction allows teachers to differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner." (SIPW pp.9), (SIP 2019 pp. 11)

Action Steps to Implement

Deliver standards-aligned instruction in every classroom:
1. Concentrate on “Essential Standards” in PLCs to focus teacher collaboration

Person Responsible	Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Utilize common assessments results to quickly inform next steps

Person Responsible	Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Establish baseline data

Person Responsible	Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Plan, implement, and monitor teacher-led, small group instruction

Person Responsible	Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Monitor small groups with walk-throughs and specific feedback

Person Responsible	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and common planning (T-Time) to plan for individual students

Person Responsible	Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA's performance from the school report card 2018-2019, ELA's lowest quartile learning gains decreased from 44% to 32%. Our leadership team has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA learning gains and overall proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the lowest quartile learning gains in ELA to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Plan, implement and monitor teacher-lead, small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"Small-Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida contends that small group instruction allows students to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner " (SIPW pp.9).(SIP 2019 pp. 11).

Action Steps to Implement

Deliver standards-aligned instruction in every classroom:
1. Concentrate on “Essential Standards” in PLCs to focus teacher collaboration (Dubrule/Hanrahan)

Person Responsible Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Implement standards focus boards during planning and instruction (Dubrule/Hanrahan)

Person Responsible Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Utilize common assessments results to quickly inform next steps

Person Responsible Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Establish baseline data

Person Responsible Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Plan, implement, and monitor teacher-led, small group instruction .

Person Responsible Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Monitor small groups with walk-throughs and specific feedback

Person Responsible Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Utilize PLCs and common planning/ Teacher Time (T-Time) to plan for individual students

Person Responsible Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Professional Development: Core Connections- Integrated Approach to Literacy/Writing

Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. Professional Development: Using your ELA resources to plan a standards-aligned lesson

Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

10. ELA Coaches will support teachers through planning.

Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency from the school report card 2018-2019, increased from 41% to 44%. Our leadership team has decided to focus on science instruction in order to improve science proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase science proficiency to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Plan, implement, and monitor teacher - lead, small group instruction. Teachers will analyze baseline data and standards to create rigorous learning tasks that are implemented for differentiated instruction during PLC's.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rigor is achieved by the careful scaffolding of information tasks according to Marzano. Also, teacher clarity has an Effect Size according to Hattie of .75. Teachers will analyze the standards and create rigorous learning tasks at PLCs. (SIP 2019, pp. 13)

Action Steps to Implement

Deliver standards-aligned instruction in every classroom:
1. Concentrate on “Essential Standards” in PLCs to focus teacher collaboration

Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Implement standards focus boards during planning and instruction

Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3.Utilize common assessments results to quickly inform next steps

Person Responsible	Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Establish baseline data

Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. SMT2 assessment given; comparison progress against baseline data

Person Responsible	Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6.Monitor small groups with walk-throughs and specific feedback

Person Responsible	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7.Utilize PLCs and common planning (T-Time) to plan for individual students

Person Responsible	Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Add a STEM elective to the special area rotation in grades 2-5

Person Responsible	Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. Professional Development: Using STEM to support Collaboration and critical thinking in the classroom

Person Responsible	Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@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.

Implement a Diversity Committee:
Develop an equity and diversity committee to challenge racism

Provide Intervention and Enrichment Opportunities:
- **Accelerate 5th-grade students in math and science**
- **Add a STEM elective to the special area rotation in grades 2-5**
- **Implement the "Read Ahead" strategy for struggling students**
- **Utilize a WTI rotation to differentiate instruction based on student learning**
- **Create a "Math Lab" elective in Middle School (MS): delivering intensive in grade 6-8**
- **Add an 8th period (Knight Hour) once a week for intervention in grades 6-8**
- **Use the "WIN" room to prescribe additional intervention opportunities to students**
- **FACT Fairs**

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.

Improve the Culture for Learning and Student Readiness
- Develop an equity and diversity committee to challenge racism
- Implement school-wide SEL curriculum as a Tier 1 support for all students
- Modify and reinforce a school-wide behavior management system
- Leverage the "House System" to promote academic achievement

Develop additional opportunities for ESSA subgroups
- Implement co-teach model for ESE students and phase out self-contained
- Focus of ELL students by scheduling providers into small group rotations
- Leverage a "Leadership" class (MS elective) for targeting students

Involve Families and Community

- Invite parents, business partners, PTSA, and community in all school events (virtual)
- Broaden our partnership with area businesses and manufactures
- Expose students to the local careers and colleges that are a available

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: Math**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**