# Campbell Middle School

**2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Campbell Middle School

625 S KEECH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

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

## Demographics

## Principal: Kimberly Matthews

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (44%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%)<br><br>2016-17: C (47%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |
| **ESSA Status** | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

## Campbell Middle School

### 625 S KEECH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

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

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2020-21 Title I School** | **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 91% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 81% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | | C | C | C |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

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

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Mills, Jennifer | School Counselor | The job duties include implementation of school improvement plan action steps, implementation of instructional practices in assigned area of PBIS school wide, and participate in all meeting of School Leadership Team and engage with all 6th grade stakeholders. |
| Williamson, Taneshia | Teacher, K-12 | The duties include monitoring and mentoring all Science instructors, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum area of Science, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps in assigned department, and participate in some recommended meetings of School Leadership Team. |
| Wallace, Keisha | Math Coach | Work collaboratively with teachers to complete coaching cycles which include: lesson planning, preconferences, observations, and analyzing student learning. Be a thought partner and not an evaluative. Support math teachers in implementing standards-based lessons through modeling, re-teaching and co-teaching. Facilitate professional learning communities that focuses on math curriculum standards and teaching practices. Support professional learning communities using data and examining curriculum standards. Serve with the school leadership team. |
| Hanrahan, Kelly | Assistant Principal | The duties include supervising all assigned ESE staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meeting of School Leadership Team, and engage with all ESE stakeholders |
| Matthews, Kimberly | Principal | The duties include supervising all instructional staff, supervising all support staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, assign School Leadership Team, coordinate meetings of School Improvement Team, engage in all stakeholders and final approval of School Improvement Plan. |
| Rushing, Christopher | Assistant Principal | PBIS Coordinator, discipline for 6th grade, safety & security |
| Owens, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | The duties include supervising all assigned ESE staff, implementation of instructional practices in assigned curriculum areas, implementation of School Improvement Plan action steps, participate in all meeting of School Leadership Team, and engage with all ESE stakeholders |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 8/31/2021, Kimberly Matthews

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**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**

64

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

864

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

15

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

15

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**2021-22**

**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 | 193 | 197 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 577 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 51 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 74 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 64 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 134 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 |

**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 | 48 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 |

**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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/9/2021

## 2020-21 - 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 | 289 | 266 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 796 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 78 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 107 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 97 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 85 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 294 |

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

| Indicator | 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 | 87 | 114 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 |

**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 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

## 2020-21 - 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 | 289 | 266 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 796 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 78 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 183 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 107 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 217 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 30 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 53 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 97 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 258 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 85 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 294 |

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

| Indicator | 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 | 87 | 114 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 |

**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 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data Review**
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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 32% | 51% | 54% | 34% | 51% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44% | 51% | 54% | 47% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44% | 42% | 47% | 48% | 43% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 28% | 54% | 58% | 34% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 36% | 51% | 57% | 43% | 55% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 33% | 42% | 51% | 39% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 34% | 58% | 51% | 37% | 61% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 63% | 71% | 72% | 61% | 69% | 72% |

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 50% | -18% | 54% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 47% | -20% | 52% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 50% | -17% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 48% | -21% | 55% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 22% | 47% | -25% | 54% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 15% | 29% | -14% | 46% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -22% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 57% | -26% | 48% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 60% | 68% | -8% | 71% | -11% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 82% | 54% | 28% | 61% | 21% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 92% | 55% | 37% | 57% | 35% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Math: SMT, DIA
ELA: VLT, DIA
Civics DIA, SMT
Science: SMT, DIA

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **English Language Arts** | All Students | 372/4% | 342/11% | 145/4% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 353/4% | 320/10% | 155/4% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 63/2% | 55/0% | 24/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 18/17% | 17/24% | 9/11% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Mathematics** | All Students | 463/14% | 442/3% | 196/16% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 445/13% | 414/3% | 185/16% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 59/2% | 74/1% | 31/3% |
| | English Language Learners | 26/15% | 27/0% | 9/44% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 360/13% | 361/24% | 183/16% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 341/12% | 338/23% | 169/16% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 52/2% | 72/6% | 33/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/8% | 16/6% | 8/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 396/17% | 266/11% | 17/29% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 378/17% | 248/11% | 16/31% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 66/3% | 39/13% | 1/100% |
| | English Language Learners | 19/16% | 13/0% | -/- |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | 365/61% | 324/69% | 787/59% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 345/61% | 302/69% | 731/59% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 55/40% | 41/46% | 114/39% |
| | English Language Learners | 18/67% | 17/71% | 43/63% |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 386/17% | 381/20% | 232/9% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 351/15% | 342/18% | 204/7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 82/6% | 78/1% | 46/2% |
| | English Language Learners | 27/0% | 24/13% | 20/0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 407/20% | 93/28% | 240/10% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 375/19% | 76/26% | 208/9% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 93/10% | 4/0% | 46/2% |
| | English Language Learners | 32/25% | -/- | 16/6% |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 397/46% | 397/41% | 454/65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 360/43% | 358/38% | 401/64% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 84/23% | 77/19% | 82/32% |
| | English Language Learners | 26/27% | 25/12% | 31/45% |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 8 | 21 | 19 | 7 | 32 | 39 | 13 | 15 | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 29 | 23 | 7 | 28 | 55 | 9 | 45 | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 30 | 22 | 20 | 36 | 41 | 24 | 57 | 62 | | |
| HSP | 34 | 42 | 54 | 33 | 26 | | 36 | 42 | 70 | | |
| MUL | 42 | 50 | | 39 | 48 | | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 49 | 20 | 48 | 49 | | 65 | 65 | 67 | | |
| FRL | 29 | 35 | 26 | 26 | 37 | 41 | 33 | 57 | 64 | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 5 | 39 | 42 | 8 | 30 | 32 | 3 | 32 | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 55 | 64 | 12 | 17 | 8 | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 40 | 41 | 22 | 35 | 35 | 26 | 60 | 75 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 39 | 54 | 53 | 32 | 33 | 17 | 36 | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 39 | 47 | | 38 | 29 | | | 58 | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 57 | 57 | 46 | 47 | 57 | 70 | 77 | 83 | | |
| FRL | 30 | 43 | 42 | 26 | 35 | 34 | 32 | 61 | 76 | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 8 | 36 | 43 | 6 | 30 | 34 | 6 | 28 | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 63 | 67 | 11 | 56 | 58 | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 42 | 45 | 27 | 38 | 36 | 29 | 53 | 76 | | |
| HSP | 35 | 54 | 73 | 28 | 52 | 53 | 38 | 73 | | | |
| MUL | 48 | 63 | | 42 | 55 | | 40 | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 54 | 40 | 56 | 54 | 41 | 56 | 79 | 84 | | |
| FRL | 33 | 46 | 47 | 32 | 43 | 39 | 34 | 59 | 73 | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 38 |
| 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 | 19 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 379 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 90% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 19 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 26 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **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% | |
| **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% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 35 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 39 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 47 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **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% | |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 52 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| --- | --- |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 37 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

## Analysis

**Data Analysis**
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Overall, decreasing learning gains, lower quartile, and proficiency in ELA. Decreasing proficiency in Math and Acceleration cells, An overall 6% decrease in Civics.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Language arts bottom quartile (from 44% to 26%), Math Acceleration (from 78% to 65%).

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Some factors contributing to lower achievement include COVID-related factors such as teacher absences, students on Volusia live, and student quarantine. Other factors include teacher turnover, new teachers, and lack of effective teaching practices. New actions could include additional support from site-based and district-based coaches, strengthening the PLC process, and creating a culture where teachers and students want to be here, feel valued, and are incentivized for positive behavior.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Math bottom quartile showed tremendous improvement, from 33% to 42%.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Strong instructional coach, effective data-driven PLC process, consistency in math department, frequent coaching and feedback provided by the math coach.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Strategies needed to accelerate learning include ensuring that PLCs are high-functioning (common assessments, assessment analyses, and action planning), data chats with students, district support (including coaching/feedback, curriculum resources such as IXL), and incentives for teachers.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Focus on professional development will be in job-embedded opportunities. These include ongoing and effective PLC's, frequent observation and feedback through both VSET and One Note, and use of ERPL time, and implementation of AVID strategies.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

PBIS training to include building relationships between teachers and students, data reviews, and middle school teaming, Saturday camps for EOC test prep, before and after school tutoring for all core classes.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1 Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Our Needs Assessment and Analysis for the 2020-2021 shows ELA achievement was 31% (down 1% from 2018-2019), ELA learning gains 36% (down 8 points from 2018-2019), and ELA lowest quartile 26% (down 18 points from 2018-2019). Further observation shows the lower quartile students include many from our ESSA sub-groups including African Americans and Student With Disabilities. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase ELA achievement for proficiency from 31% to 41%, ELA learning gains from 36% to 49%, and ELA lower quartile from 26% to 41%. |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored through data chats on school/district/ state data during PLC and instructional leadership meetings, cross curriculum data and instructional chats, adjusting instruction based on students' data, use of standards-based instruction in teacher lesson plans monitored by administration, use of WIN to target student needs for remediation, observations based on weekly walk throughs, and monitoring of academic work achievement during discipline or absent time. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | PLC process, teacher clarity, utilization of researched based practices, standards aligned instruction using the BEST standards, small group instruction, differentiation, IPG, focus boards, ELA coaching support in the classroom. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in math. John Hatties effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .84, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers is .72, learning goals vs no learning goals .68, and teacher feedback .76. Research on standards-based instruction have been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** | |
| --- | --- |
| Weekly PLC meetings that focus on the four questions related to student learning. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Walk through tool professional development for teachers and administration. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Support Facilitation model training for gen-ed and ESE teachers. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Common planning time for all ELA teachers. | |

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

PLC meetings weekly for all ELA teachers

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Standards and Learning targets posted daily in the classrooms.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Standards-based remediation during WIN time

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Standards-based ELA resources will be available for all teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Academic Intervention teachers for each grade level in ELA.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Implementation of targeted ELA programs to reduce achievement gaps.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Weekly instructional leadership meeting to discuss data and monitoring student progress for cross curriculum support.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

AVID strategies in ELA for selected 6th grade students.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1 Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Our Needs Assessment and Analysis for the 2020-2021 shows math achieve was 28% (same as 2018-2019), math learning gains 38% (increase of 2 points from 2018-2019), and math lowest quartile 42% (increase of 9 from 2018-2019). Further observation shows the lower quartile students include many from our ESSA sub-groups including African Americans and Student With Disabilities. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase math achievement for proficiency from 28% to 41%, math learning gains from 38% to 41%, and math lower quartile from 42% to 44%. |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored through data chats on school/district/ state data during PLC and instructional leadership meetings, cross curriculum data and instructional chats, adjusting instruction based on students' data, use of standards-based instruction in teacher lesson plans monitored by administration, use of WIN to target student needs for remediation, observations based on weekly walk throughs, and monitoring of academic work achievement during discipline or absent time. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Keisha Wallace (klwallac@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence-based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome is standards-based instruction through all stakeholders of the school. The outcome will be monitored by administration and coaches' observations through walk throughs and include individual teacher feedback to guide them in standards based planning and instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in math. John Hatties effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .84, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers is .72, learning goals vs no learning goals .68, and teacher feedback .76. Research on standards-based instruction have been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Common planning period for all Math teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Weekly PLC meetings for all Math teachers with instructional coach support.

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

Lesson standards and Learning targets posted in the classrooms.

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

Learning walks with staff and district personnel to ensure instruction is being delivered during the proper timeframe and to the rigor of the standards.

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

AVID strategies for selected students in 6th grade.

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

WIN time will be utilized to remediate standards and close achievement gaps.

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

Academic intervention teacher in Math for each grade level.

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

Before school and after school tutoring in Math.

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

Administrative walk throughs to observe teacher and student use of knowledge of standards during instruction.

**Person Responsible**     Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walk through tool professional development for teachers and administration.

**Person Responsible**     Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly instructional leadership meeting to discuss data and monitoring student progress for cross curriculum support.

**Person Responsible**     Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

| | |
|---|---|
| **#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 3. Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. We will focus on using the positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based / three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day." PBIS creates schools that support everyone – especially students with disabilities. PBIS relies on strategies that are respectful of a person's dignity and overall well-being and that are drawn primarily from behavioral, educational, and social sciences, although other evidence-based procedures may be incorporated. PBS may be applied within a multi-tiered framework at the level of the individual and at the level of larger systems. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Campbell Middle School had a large number of referrals in the 2020-2021 school, we believe that with common expectations, common language across campus and common consequences and rewards we will be able to reduce the number of referrals by 10% than we have at the end of the school year. Through monthly PBIS meetings we will be able to track data and use our district resources to help change the culture, climate and drastically reduce the behavior issues on campus and in classrooms allowing for high quality instruction to take place. |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored through data chats based on referrals, PASS, suspension, and academic achievement. The outcome will be monitored by PBIS Team and administration discipline data analyzing and observations through walk throughs including feedback to all stakeholders. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence-based strategy will be Positive Behavior Intervention and Support. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support is Classroom Management has an effect size of .52. Expectations and clarity of behavior expectations is fundamental to implementing PBIS. Teacher Clarity (.75 Effect Size) and PBIS are both based on the fundamentals of transparent expectations. Feedback also has an effect size of .75. PBIS is a behavior intervention system that works best with immediate rewards for positive behavior. Teachers rewarding behavior is feedback. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Monthly meetings with PBIS team.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

PBIS training and expectations for all staff members.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

PBIS training and expectations given for all students.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

PBIS expectations will be posted in all classrooms and high frequency areas so students will be reminded daily of the expectations.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Implementing a school-wide reward system.

| **Person Responsible** | Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**Data for the 2020-2021 school year was not in the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website so we previewed the 2019-2020 data. We utilized data from the Power BI website to determine a goal of reducing disciplinary referrals by 25%. We will implement a PBIS initiative that focuses on and rewards positive behavior. This is in line with research based best practice. We will also utilize SEL activities to help students learn appropriate strategies.**

## 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.

We will focus on using the positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based / three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day." PBIS creates schools that support everyone – especially students with disabilities. PBIS relies on strategies that are respectful of a person's dignity and overall well-being and that are drawn primarily from behavioral, educational, and social sciences, although other evidence-based procedures may be incorporated. PBS may be applied within a multi-tiered framework at the level of the individual and at the level of larger systems.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Through monthly PBIS meetings we will be able to track data and use our district resources to help change the culture, climate and drastically reduce the behavior issues on campus and in classrooms allowing for high quality instruction to take place. This area of focus will be monitored through data chats at monthly PBIS meetings based on referrals, PASS, suspension, and academic achievement. The outcome will be monitored by PBIS Team and administration discipline data analyzing.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |