Volusia County Schools

Atlantic High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| | 10 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 27 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

Demographics

Principal: Jason Watson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2021

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School PK, 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 97% |
| 2020-21 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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | rmation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | SIG Cohort 3 |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| 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

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | I Disadvant | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| High Scho PK, 9-12 | | No | | 61% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 41% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | В | В | В |

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.

At Atlantic High School, personal responsibility is an essential component of our curriculum. In order to emphasize and teach personal responsibility, we believe that teachers, students, and parents must clearly understand the role each must play in helping every one of our students to achieve academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Atlantic High School, every person is treated with dignity and respect. We welcome and encourage students, families, staff and community to learn together. Our students develop their unique talents to graduate with the greatest treasure—enthusiasm for lifelong learning as responsible, creative citizens.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Alves, Dawn | Assistant Principal | Curriculum |
| Doster, Julian | Assistant Principal | Discipline/Security |
| Culver, Tracia | Assistant Principal | Data |
| Casey, Kelli | Instructional Coach | Literacy Coach |
| Sparger, Klmberly | Math Coach | |
| Watson, Jason | Principal | |
| Lind, Kathleen | Other | |
| Gariepy, Darlene | Dean | |
| Thompson, Althia | Assistant Principal | ESE Services |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/25/2021, Jason Watson

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 82

Total number of students enrolled at the school 1,265

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 26

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | evel | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 363 | 304 | 319 | 265 | 1251 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 53 | 54 | 52 | 227 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 47 | 43 | 31 | 167 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 37 | 27 | 20 | 124 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 85 | 82 | 55 | 338 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 58 | 46 | 25 | 225 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 140 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | G | irac | l et | _ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 63 | 51 | 231 | 384 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 25 | 21 | 90 | 146 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 47 | 76 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 401 | 346 | 355 | 254 | 1356 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 145 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 60 | 39 | 34 | 215 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 88 | 73 | 50 | 315 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 49 | 29 | 24 | 187 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | G | irac | l et | _ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|-----|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 77 | 61 | 45 | 297 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | G | rad | e L | eve | l | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 32 | 19 | 2 | 95 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 23 | 19 | 7 | 62 |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 401 | 346 | 355 | 254 | 1356 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 145 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 60 | 39 | 34 | 215 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 88 | 73 | 50 | 315 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 49 | 29 | 24 | 187 |

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

| Indicator K | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|-------|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 77 | 61 | 45 | 297 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 32 | 19 | 2 | 95 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 23 | 19 | 7 | 62 |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 50% | 52% | 56% | 50% | 51% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 51% | 49% | 51% | 47% | 47% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 37% | 42% | 30% | 37% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 48% | 48% | 51% | 53% | 49% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 50% | 49% | 48% | 51% | 50% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 50% | 38% | 45% | 36% | 44% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 81% | 76% | 68% | 82% | 71% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 62% | 69% | 73% | 56% | 66% | 71% |

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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 51% | -2% | 55% | -6% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 53% | -3% |
| Cohort Con | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |

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

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

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 78% | 72% | 6% | 67% | 11% |
| | | CIVIC | S EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 59% | 63% | -4% | 70% | -11% |
| <u> </u> | | ALGEE | RA EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 61% | -19% |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | - | | | | |
| 2019 | 49% | 55% | -6% | 57% | -8% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Power BI is used for progress monitoring. Additional data was provided by our REA Department.

| | | Grade 9 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 503/23 | 528/24 | 282/28 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 336/21 | 362/21 | 192/23 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 89/13 | 93/13 | 49/16 |
| | English Language Learners | 21/10 | 23/9 | 13/8 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 348/4 | 433/9 | 368/5 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 250/4 | 308/7 | 267/4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 74/3 | 87/6 | 72/4 |
| | English Language Learners | 17/6 | 21/14 | 17/0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 343/80 | 253/70 | 234/86 |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | 179/77 | 120/71 | 116/82 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21/57 | 14/50 | 11/82 |
| | English Language Learners | 5/60 | 4/25 | 2/100 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 2/0 | 4/0 | 2/0 |
| US History | Economically Disadvantaged | | 3/0 | 1/0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/0 | 1/0 | |
| | English Language Learners | 2/0 | 1/0 | 1/0 |

| | | Grade 10 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 405/34 | 233/31 | 457/38 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 243/28 | 145/32 | 280/34 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 77/16 | 46/9 | 89/19 |
| | English Language Learners | 7/14 | 5/40 | 7/14 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 94/4 | 201/16 | 101/12 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 61/5 | 127/17 | 65/9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/8 | 30/17 | 15/7 |
| | English Language Learners | 2/0 | 5/22 | 3/0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 329/46 | 212/37 | 224/65 |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | 226/44 | 143/36 | 150/65 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 75/32 | 48/25 | 55/51 |
| | English Language Learners | 9/33 | 5/20 | 6/100 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22/27 | 44/16 | 16/44 |
| US History | Economically Disadvantaged | 18/33 | 37/19 | 12/33 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/40 | 11/18 | 4/25 |
| | English Language Learners | 1/0 | 4/25 | 2/0 |

| | | Grade 11 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 166/49 | 172/34 | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 110/43 | 111/31 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32/34 | 33/33 | |
| | English Language Learners | 3/33 | 4/50 | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 63/0 | 130/8 | 71/11 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 45/0 | 91/8 | 50/10 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25/0 | 51/6 | 25/20 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 108/31 | 71/24 | 72/63 |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | 88/28 | 56/23 | 58/59 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42/24 | 30/23 | 27/67 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 230/45 | 364/40 | 129/74 |
| US History | Economically Disadvantaged | 142/41 | 221/34 | 79/72 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45/36 | 71/30 | 26/54 |
| | English Language Learners | 7/14 | 10/30 | 3/33 |

| | | Grade 12 | | |
|--------------------------|---|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 112/53 | 110/47 | 5/0 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 67/49 | 67/45 | 5/0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23/43 | 25/44 | 4/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 3/33 | 2/0 | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 11/0 | 25/9 | 10/0 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/0 | 21/10 | 9/10 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/0 | 7/14 | 4/0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 1/0 | 1/0 | |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | 1/0 | 1/0 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/0 | 1/0 | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10/50 | 10/40 | 3/67 |
| US History | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/38 | 10/40 | 3/67 |
| S D E | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 8/38 | 7/29 | 1/100 |

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 | 21 | 33 | 27 | 16 | 30 | 32 | 42 | 47 | | 82 | 27 | |
| ELL | 23 | 45 | | 23 | 30 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 35 | 26 | 11 | 29 | 35 | 46 | 38 | | 89 | 26 | |
| HSP | 42 | 50 | | 13 | 11 | | 59 | 31 | | 97 | 26 | |
| MUL | 41 | 45 | | 30 | 33 | | 64 | 50 | | 91 | 30 | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 58 | 52 | 44 | 32 | 27 | 26 | 76 | 65 | | 85 | 53 |
| FRL | 38 | 42 | 36 | 21 | 27 | 33 | 60 | 48 | | 85 | 33 |
| 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 | 16 | 41 | 45 | 27 | 45 | 50 | 48 | 37 | | 79 | 9 |
| ELL | | 50 | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | 100 | 55 |
| BLK | 36 | 50 | 47 | 31 | 48 | 39 | 67 | 45 | | 81 | 18 |
| HSP | 42 | 36 | 21 | 43 | 38 | | 63 | 52 | | 67 | 58 |
| MUL | 53 | 58 | | 47 | 45 | | 73 | | | 69 | 27 |
| WHT | 56 | 54 | 52 | 56 | 51 | 59 | 87 | 73 | | 86 | 45 |
| FRL | 42 | 48 | 50 | 43 | 51 | 53 | 75 | 56 | | 80 | 35 |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 23 | 38 | 28 | 22 | 21 | 12 | 46 | 21 | | 80 | 29 |
| BLK | 28 | 37 | 21 | 32 | 32 | 25 | 58 | 30 | | 93 | 30 |
| HSP | 49 | 43 | 40 | 48 | 44 | 45 | 83 | 50 | | 80 | 69 |
| MUL | 59 | 50 | | 57 | 58 | | 100 | | | 92 | 45 |
| WHT | 58 | 51 | 33 | 63 | 56 | 41 | 88 | 67 | | 90 | 62 |
| FRL | 44 | 42 | 28 | 47 | 45 | 35 | 77 | 50 | | 82 | 49 |

ESSA Data Review

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

| This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/13/2021. | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|
| ESSA Federal Index | | | |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 | | |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 36 | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 500 | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 | | |
| Percent Tested | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 | | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 31 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 48 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

Math and ELA achievement levels overall are areas of concern for us along with lowest quartile in both math and ELA. Additional sub groups of concern are our students with disabilities and African American students.

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

Algebra 1, Geometry, and 9th grade ELA proficiency are the areas of greatest concern.

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

Contributing factors for lower performing areas include teacher vacancy in math courses that took months to fill, lack of small group and hands on instruction that was limited by Covid 19 protocols, and a 1st year teacher in 9th grade ELA that has since left Atlantic.

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

Our graduation rate increased by 5% as well as our SWD performance in SS Achievement up 10%. We have maintained A-level performance in science although the percent of students meetings with proficiency is down overall compared to 2019.

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

Focus on graduation assurance and the waiving of FSA/EOC testing requirements supported an increase in graduation rate. Stable ESE teacher support in the US History classes as well as data driven remediation plans have contributed to an increase in student performance as well.

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

Collaborative practices among general education and ESE teachers, cross-curricular literacy support strategies (WICOR), training on teacher clarity, and supporting learning utilizing tech tools will all help to accelerate learning.

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.

- -Teacher Clarity
- -WICOR (AVID) strategies
- -Low Quartile/SWD Support
- -Culturally Responsive Teaching
- -Tech Tools
- -Grading practices

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

Weekly PLCS via common planning, AHS walk-through document to collect data and provide targeted feedback on SIP goals, model lessons/in-house observation of peers on best practices, PLC planning days.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of **Focus** Description

and

A result of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall achievement in ELA was down by 3% from 2019. Additionally, our ELA learning gains were down 4% and our LQ achievement in ELA down 12% - below the state average. Further analysis revealed that many of our students identified in the ELA low quartile are also in one or both

of our low performing sub groups: SWD & AA students. Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Increase ELA overall achievement by 7% to 54% and low quartile achievement by 5% to

41% overall.

This area will be monitored weekly by admin team via power BI data review, weekly walk throughs using the AHS walk-through document to collect data and provide specific

Monitoring: feedback, targeted coaching cycles, bi-monthly coaches meetings to review progress on

coaching cycles and identify impact.

Person responsible

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us) for

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based Standards-aligned instructional practice (Teacher Clarity)

Strategy:

Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of Rationale instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the

for Evidencebased Strategy:

goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success

for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Atlantic will engage teachers in both district and school-specific professional learning plan based on our SIP goals to include school-wide WICOR strategies implementation, standards-aligned instructional practice, and peer observation

Person Responsible

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide feedback and follow up coaching.

Person Responsible

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs and use TEAMS to collaborate with the PLC on standards aligned instructional practice using PLC framework. PLC work will include monitoring of LQ students, ESSA subgroups and documentation of support in lesson plans

Person

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Administration and academic coaches will provide PLC support and follow up

Person Responsible

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage students in targeted remediation based on data and student need

Person

Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Responsible

Admin will engage in monthly "stock take" data review using Power BI to track and monitor progress on SIP goals

Person

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

School will implement a schedule for ELA data chats & data day for teachers

Person

Responsible

Kelli Casey (kscasey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Student surveys will be implemented each semester to collect feedback from students on the quality of instruction

Person

Responsible

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of **Focus** Description

and

A result of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall achievement in Math was down by 24% from 2019. Additionally, our ELA learning gains were down 23% and our LQ achievement in ELA down 16% - well below the state average. Further analysis revealed that many of our students identified in the Math low quartile are also in one or both of our low performing sub groups: SWD & AA students.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Increase math achievement by 20% overall and the learning gains by 15%.

This area will be monitored weekly by admin team via power BI data review, weekly walk

throughs using the AHS walk-through document to collect data and provide specific

feedback, targeted coaching cycles, bi-monthly coaches meetings to review progress on

coaching cycles and identify impact.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for

Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based Standards-aligned instructional practice (Teacher Clarity)

Strategy:

Rationale for Evidencebased

Strategy:

Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success

for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Atlantic will engage teachers in both district and school-specific professional learning plan based on our SIP goals to include school-wide WICOR strategies implementation, standards-aligned instructional practice, and peer observation

Person

Responsible

Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide feedback and follow up coaching

Person

Responsible

Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs and use TEAMS to collaborate with the PLC on standards aligned instructional practice using PLC framework. PLC work will include monitoring of LQ students, ESSA subgroups and documentation of support in lesson plans

Person

Responsible

Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and academic coaches will provide PLC support and follow up

Person

Responsible

Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage students in targeted remediation based on data and student need.

Person
Responsible Klmberly Sparger (kcsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Admin will engage in monthly "stock take" data review using Power BI to track and monitor progress on SIP goals

Person ResponsibleJason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School will implement specific technology (Algebra/Geometry Nation, Kahn Academy) to support students

Person
Responsible Klmberly Sparger (kcsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Student surveys will be implemented each semester to collect feedback from students on the quality of instruction

Person
Responsible Klmberly Sparger (kcsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of **Focus** Description and Rationale:

A result of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall achievement for our SWD is below average in both ELA (at 20%) and Math (at 16%). Further analysis revealed that many of our students identified in the ELA and Math low quartile are also in one or both of our low performing sub groups: SWD & AA students.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase ESSA subgroup achievement to 41% overall in both ELA and Math - 21% in ELA

and 35% in Math.

This area will be monitored weekly by admin team via power BI data review, weekly walk throughs using the AHS walk-through document to collect data and provide specific

feedback, targeted coaching cycles, bi-monthly coaches meetings to review progress on **Monitoring:**

coaching cycles and identify impact. Additional monitoring will occur via ESE data chats

with case management.

Person responsible

for Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based Standards-aligned instructional practice (Teacher Clarity)

Strategy:

Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75,

for Evidencebased

Strategy:

Rationale

Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success

for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning for faculty on support of students in subgroups to include ASPECTS and collaborative practices

Person

Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Problem Solving Team for EARLY identification of students in need of additional supports

Person Responsible

Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLC work will include monitoring of ESSA subgroup data and documentation of support in PLC minutes/lesson plans

Person

Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Admin will engage in monthly "stock take" data review using Power BI to track and monitor progress on SIP goals

Person Responsible

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

D/F report reviewed quarterly to begin early intervention for underclassmen

Page 24 of 28 Last Modified: 5/3/2024 https://www.floridacims.org

Person

Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Responsible

Case management for SWD to include data chats & graduation progress monitoring (ESSA)

Person

Responsible

Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Daily "Shark Lab" to provide additional time for targeted remediation of students

Person

Responsible

Althia Thompson (agthomps@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and

A result of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall achievement for our African American Subgroup is below average in both ELA (down 9% to 25% from 2019) and Math (down 20% to 11% from 2019). Further analysis revealed that many of our students identified in the ELA and Math low quartile are also in one or both of our low

Rationale: performing sub groups: SWD & AA students.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase ESSA subgroup achievement for African American Students to 41% overall in

both ELA and Math - 16% in ELA and 30% in Math.

This area will be monitored weekly by admin team via power BI data review, weekly walk

Monitoring: throughs using the AHS walk-through document to collect data and provide specific

feedback, targeted coaching cycles, bi-monthly coaches meetings to review progress on

coaching cycles and identify impact.

Person responsible

for Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based Standards-aligned instructional practice (Teacher Clarity)

Strategy:

Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75,

for Evidencebased Strategy:

Rationale

Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success

for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning for faculty on support of students in subgroups to include culturally sensitive teaching

Person Responsible

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Problem Solving Team for EARLY identification of students in need of additional supports

Person Responsible

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

Weekly PLC work will include monitoring of ESSA subgroup data and documentation of support in PLC minutes/lesson plans

Person

Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Responsible

Admin will engage in monthly "stock take" data review using Power BI to track and monitor progress on SIP goals

Person

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

D/F report reviewed quarterly to begin early intervention for underclassmen

Person Responsible

Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Daily "Shark Lab" to provide additional time for targeted remediation of students

Person

Responsible Dawn Alves (dmalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Primary concern is 9th grade discipline data which will be monitored closed with quarterly discipline updates and intervention plans.

Interventions will include:

Teacher training on classroom management (monthly moment on faculty meeting agenda) 9th grade induction 1st week of school to communicate campus behavior expectations 9th grade assembly to communicate on-going behavior expectations/concerns as they are identified

Monthly behavior rewards/recognition for students making positive behavior changes Use of PASS

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.

Yearly school orientation, school-based freshmen induction program, mentoring and student leadership are all critical components in establishing and maintaining positive relationships between teachers and students on campus as well as cultivating a sense of family.

Our freshmen orientation is designed to acquaint new students with our campus and with our student leaders. Through this year's orientation process, incoming 9th graders will be learn about campus life and available activities, have the opportunity to receive volunteer training, learn about acceleration opportunities and more. All freshmen are provided with a school-made agenda planner that includes graduation assurance information that is reviewed during orientation and again during the first week of school in ELA

classes. Students will be educated on campus procedures for safety and security through as well.

The majority of our teachers also serve as mentors to at-risk student populations to add another level of support for our Sharks and to create the supportive environment that many need to succeed. These programs include Check and Connect Mentoring for ESE at-risk students and mentoring for our at-risk seniors.

Through our guidance department and AVID program, students are exposed to college and career opportunities monthly through physical and virtual college tours, FAFSA completion, college application planning and support, and a college and career day that includes over 50 college/universities as well as local and state agencies/organizations such as Daytona Beach Police Department, Florida Fish and Wildlife and more.

Through an active School Advisory Committee that meets monthly, decisions are made regarding school vision, improvement goals, community involvement and the spending of funds to support school needs. Our SAC includes teachers, students, parents, school support staff, our town mayor, and a school board member. In addition to our SAC, our Academies have implemented an Academy Advisory Board for each of our nine career academies. These boards meet a minimum of twice a year and help advise the direction of our academies, create internship opportunities for students, support with fundraising, and collaborate with academy directors on curriculum and career opportunities for our academy students. Each academy has student ambassadors that also sit on these boards and participate in the process to give student voice.

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

Stakeholders include our SAC committee that meet monthly to review school needs and allocate funds for classroom requests that support school improvement. Our student government also play an active role on our SAC to ensure student voice. We have an established teacher leadership team that meet monthly to discuss school/teacher/student need and work to cultivate positive school culture via collaboration and social events (luncheons, fun friday photos, etc). Additional culture-building initiatives include student of the month recognition for scholar, citizen and athlete, pep rallys, quarterly school-wide literacy activities, and quarterly teacher recognition.