

Volusia County Schools

Holly Hill 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 | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 30 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 31 |

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Voges J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 31 |

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School PK-8 | Yes | 88% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 67% |

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Henry, Derrick | Assistant Principal | Grades PK-5, All things administrative |
| Dubrule, Lisa | Instructional Coach | Elementary ELA Coach |
| Cone, Mallory | Instructional Coach | Secondary Academic Coach |
| Payne, Tamara | SAC Member | SAC Chair |
| Zablo, Michael | Assistant Principal | Grades 6-8, All things administrative |
| Friedman, Stephanie | Math Coach | K-8 Math Coach |
| Iannarelli, Heather | Principal | |
| Glaenzer, Stephanie | Other | Dean of Student relations, discipline, restorative practices, administrative duties |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/23/2021, Robert Voges J

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

94

Total number of students enrolled at the school

938

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

13

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

13

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 14 | 26 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

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 | 66 | 101 | 105 | 89 | 82 | 78 | 118 | 106 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 839 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 42 | 28 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 54 | 34 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 36 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 66 | 101 | 105 | 89 | 82 | 78 | 118 | 106 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 839 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 42 | 28 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 54 | 34 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 36 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | | | | 35% | 54% | 61% | 34% | 57% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 43% | 53% | 59% | 42% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 32% | 44% | 54% | 44% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 34% | 55% | 62% | 37% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 40% | 52% | 59% | 43% | 50% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 45% | 52% | 43% | 46% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 44% | 61% | 56% | 41% | 64% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 56% | 72% | 78% | 57% | 75% | 77% |

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 |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 58% | -29% | 58% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 58% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -29% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 56% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 30% | 50% | -20% | 54% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 47% | -19% | 52% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 50% | -23% | 56% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -28% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 60% | -28% | 62% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 59% | -26% | 64% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 60% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 21% | 48% | -27% | 55% | -34% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 47% | -24% | 54% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -21% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 17% | 29% | -12% | 46% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -23% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 53% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 57% | -19% | 48% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| 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 | 47% | 68% | -21% | 71% | -24% |
| 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 | 90% | 54% | 36% | 61% | 29% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Number is total students tested (could consist of more than 1 assessment)/ Proficiency is percentage of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment.

5th grade-For the Science section the number represents the total number of students tested. This number consists of more than one assessment. / Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments.

6-7th grade ELA, Math and Science utilized DIA data for progress monitoring.

8th grade Math, ELA and Science Utilized SMT and DIA data for progress monitoring.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 98/14.29% | 108/29.63% | 115/46.96% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 93/11.83% | 101/26.73% | 105/43.81% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23/8.70% | 24/8.33% | 26/19.23% |
| | English Language Learners | 14/0.00% | 16/6.25% | 17/29.41% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 96/8.33% | 108/13.89% | 107/34.58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 91/7.69% | 102/12.75% | 97/31.96% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23/4.35% | 23/4.35% | 21/9.52% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/0.00% | 16/6.25% | 18/31.15% |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 117/16.24% | 130/26.92% | 123/35.52% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 113/15.93% | 127/25.98% | 117/31.62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/16.67% | 15/20.00% | 15/13.33% |
| | English Language Learners | 10/0.00% | 11/18.18% | 12/33.33% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 113/5.31% | 122/15.57% | 117/21.37% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 109/4.59% | 119/15.13% | 111/21.62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/8.33% | 13/7.69% | 13/7.69% |
| | English Language Learners | 9/11.11% | 12/8.33% | 12/0.00% |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 80/23.75% | 84/35.71% | 90/45.56% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 76/22.37% | 80/33.75% | 84/42.86% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16/0.00% | 16/6.25% | 20/5.00% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/7.69% | 14/21.43% | 14/28.57% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 76/5.26% | 83/15.66% | 84/29.76% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 72/4.17% | 80/15.00% | 78/29.49% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15/0.00% | 16/0.00% | 16/6.25% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/0.00% | 14/0.00% | 14/7.14% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 82/14.63% | 93/31.18% | 92/36.96% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 72/11.11% | 82/28.05% | 78/34.62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13/0.00% | 14/0.00% | 13/0.00% |
| | English Language Learners | 12/0.00% | 13/23.08% | 14/35.71% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 82/6.10% | 90/16.67% | 94/44.68% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 72/4.17% | 79/13.92% | 80/46.25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/0.00% | 13/0.00% | 13/7.69% |
| | English Language Learners | 12/0.00% | 13/0.00% | 14/50.00% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 79/22.5% | 88/27.37% | 88/30.43% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 76/22.08% | 83/27.78% | 79/30.49% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17/5.56% | 19/13.04% | 18/5.00% |
| | English Language Learners | 12/8.33% | 13/14.29% | 11/27.27% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 74/12.16% | 82/24.39% | 91/36.26% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 71/11.27% | 79/24.05% | 82/39.02% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13/0.000% | 18/0.00% | 19/5.26% |
| | English Language Learners | 12/16.67% | 11/27.27% | 12/41.67% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 366/34% | 323/56% | 247/73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 351/34% | 307/59% | 227/74% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 77/13% | 64/31% | 49/56% |
| | English Language Learners | 57/40% | 49/54% | 34/83% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 6 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 195/7% | 208/15% | 117/6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 174/6% | 186/13% | 100/5% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25/0% | 43/2% | 18/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 26/8% | 24/8% | 13/8% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 214/19% | 232/13% | 46/43% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 191/17% | 204/12% | 34/41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37/5% | 43/7% | 1/100% |
| | English Language Learners | 26/15% | 25/8% | 4/25% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 151/19% | 190/24% | 90/18% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 141/19% | 173/25% | 83/18% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24/4% | 37/11% | 17/6% |
| | English Language Learners | 16/44% | 18/44% | 8/50% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 179/4% | 103/1% | - |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 165/5% | 93/1% | - |
| | Students With Disabilities | 34/0% | 18/0% | - |
| | English Language Learners | 17/6% | 13/0% | - |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 178/48% | 177/47% | 297/49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 164/48% | 162/48% | 271/49% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33/39% | 32/28% | 59/39% |
| | English Language Learners | 18/61% | 15/67% | 27/67% |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 185/23% | 173/30% | 99/4% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 167/22% | 158/28% | 88/3% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32/13% | 31/16% | 21/5% |
| | English Language Learners | 20/5% | 19/32% | 11/0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 135/7% | 45/7% | 22/14% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 121/7% | 41/7% | 20/15% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21/0% | 4/0% | 3/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 16/13% | 4/0% | 3/33% |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 167/52% | 154/55% | 165/72% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 151/50% | 138/53% | 144/73% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29/34% | 27/33% | 31/61% |
| | English Language Learners | 20/60% | 20/55% | 22/77% |

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 | 7 | 26 | 27 | 4 | 25 | 26 | 30 | 33 | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 67 | 58 | 27 | 35 | 20 | 61 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 35 | 27 | 20 | 32 | 25 | 33 | 53 | 50 | | |
| HSP | 37 | 60 | 50 | 31 | 33 | 24 | 56 | 82 | 70 | | |
| MUL | 38 | 71 | | 43 | 43 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 38 | 33 | 32 | 37 | 35 | 46 | 53 | 83 | | |
| FRL | 32 | 41 | 36 | 26 | 35 | 26 | 42 | 58 | 68 | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 13 | 26 | 28 | 11 | 27 | 27 | 17 | 12 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 44 | 33 | 38 | 47 | 39 | 41 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 37 | 32 | 19 | 29 | 31 | 32 | 47 | | | |

| 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 | 40 | 46 | 27 | 42 | 46 | 33 | 44 | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | 46 | | 57 | 62 | | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 46 | 35 | 41 | 46 | 39 | 54 | 66 | 82 | | |
| FRL | 34 | 43 | 31 | 33 | 39 | 36 | 45 | 53 | 84 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 7 | 33 | 35 | 10 | 32 | 38 | 14 | 6 | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 41 | 64 | 38 | 31 | 42 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 38 | 40 | 29 | 40 | 42 | 35 | 46 | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 46 | 63 | 40 | 42 | 38 | 57 | 69 | | | |
| MUL | 43 | 42 | | 34 | 33 | | 33 | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 48 | 47 | 44 | 61 | 52 | | |
| FRL | 33 | 41 | 44 | 36 | 43 | 43 | 40 | 59 | 67 | | |

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 | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 52 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 424 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| 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 | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| 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 | 33 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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?

Overall, ELA Achievement was at 41% proficient in 2021, with 2019 being 45% proficient. This is a loss of 4%

ELA LG were at 42% in 2021, with 2019 at 43%, which is a loss of 1%.

ELA LQ in 2021 is 35%, 2019 being 32% resulted in a 3% growth.

Math achievement for 2021 is 28%, with 2019 being 34%, which is a loss of 6%. Math LG were at 35% in 2021, with 2019 at 40 this is a loss of 5%.

Math LQ in 2021 is at 26% proficient, with 2019 being at 36% proficient, this is a loss of 10%.

Science achievement held at 44% both years, and Social Studies Achievement went up 1% in 2021 (from 56% to 57% proficient)

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

The greatest area for improvement based upon state data and progress monitoring would be core instruction in Math and ELA.

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 would be the movement from students from at-home, or online learning to in-person. The number of students and teachers on quarantine also affected the number of students able to test. Another factor is the participation level of many students and parents during online learning.

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

The data components showing the most improvement would be Social Studies achievement (+1%) and ELA LQ (+3%).

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

Small- group instruction to support LQ ELA was a focus that contributed to this growth. We also have an intervention teacher assisting with Social Studies on a regular basis. Holly Hill implemented many interventions last school year that included; Walk to Intervention, trainings for educators in the area of small- group, remediation and tutoring for all in small groups.

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

Our evidence-based strategy is to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate differentiated standards-aligned instruction for small groups. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction.

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.

Provide opportunities to attend professional learning focused SGI differentiation, PL and ELA and Math content/curriculum.

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

Continue to implement a system for collaboration during weekly planning time, conduct student data chats (minimum quarterly), establish baseline data early in the year, utilize intervention in the ELA and Math content areas, and review LQD/ Schedules to focus on student placement for interventions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1. Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our students with disabilities ELA proficiency was at 7% in 2019 and remained at 7% in 2021. Math proficiency was at 35% in 2019 and decreased to 4% 2021. After further analysis it was revealed that most of the students in our SWD subgroup were also in our Lowest Quartile. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Our goal is to increase our learning gains for students in disabilities in ELA and Math to 40% |
| Monitoring: | This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observation using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA and math look-fors, and student data chats to self- minor and set goals, teacher data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Our evidence- based strategy is to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate differentiated standards- aligned instruction for small groups. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school- based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Setting learning goals with students has a .68 effect size according to Joh Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and just Read Florida recommends small- group instruction allows students to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner. |

Action Steps to Implement

Student data chats to analyze data and set learning goals

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

Facilitate Professional Learning including small- group instruction

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

Collaborate during weekly planning time, including training teachers on the look fors for small- group instruction.

Person Responsible Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walk to intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains

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

Attend professional learning focused on SGI differentiation, PL and ELA and Math content/curriculum

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

After- School tutoring small groups

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1; Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 35% in 2019 and decreased to 34% in 2021. Math proficiency was at 34% in 2019 and decreased 28% in 2021.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA overall proficiency from 34% to 45%. Increase math overall proficiency from 28% to 45%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored by the submission of a weekly collaborative planning tool that encompasses the focus standard, learning target, check for understanding, and delivery of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our Evidence- Based Strategy us to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate differentiated standards- aligned instruction for small groups. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school- based administration, coaches and the district support team. Grade- level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collective Teacher Efficacy has 1.57 effect size, according to John Hattie. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who:

- * Have appropriately high expectations
- * Share the notions of success criteria with their students
- * Ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment.
- * Ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensive to students; and
- * Provide welcome feedback about where to move to next

Action Steps to Implement

Review LQD/ Schedules to focus on student placement for interventions

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate Professional Learning including small- group instruction

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

Collaborate during weekly planning time

Person Responsible Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize Collaborative Planning Tool

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

Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains.

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

Attend professional learning focused on SGI differentiation, PL and ELA and Math content/curriculum

Person Responsible Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1; Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 35% in 2019 and decreased to 34% in 2021.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in ELA overall proficiency from 34% to 45%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observation using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA Look- fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence- based strategy is to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate differentiated standards-aligned instruction for small groups. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small- Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and just Read Florida recommends small group instruction allows students to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner (SIPW pp.9).

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize intervention teachers for ELA instruction

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review LQD/ Schedules to focus on student placement for interventions

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning including small group instruction

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

Establish baseline data

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

Conduct student data chat (minimum quarterly)

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborate during weekly planning time, including training teachers on the look fors for small- group instruction.

Person Responsible Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains

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

Attend professional learning focused SGI differentiation, PL and ELA and Math content/curriculum

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

Remediation and tutoring small groups

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1; Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math proficiency was at 34% in 2019 and decreased to 28% in 2021.

Measurable Outcome: Increase math overall proficiency from 28% to 45%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observation using a walkthrough tool with specific Math Look- fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence- based strategy is to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate differentiated standards-aligned instruction for small groups. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small- Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and just Read Florida recommends small group instruction allows students to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner (SIPW pp.9).

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize intervention teachers for Math instruction

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review LQD/ Schedules to focus on student placement for interventions

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning including small group instruction

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

Establish baseline data

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

Conduct student data chat (minimum quarterly)

Person Responsible Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborate during weekly planning time, including training teachers on the look fors for small- group instruction.

Person Responsible Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains

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

Attend professional learning focused SGI differentiation, PL and ELA and Math content/curriculum

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

Remediation and tutoring small groups

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

After comparing our discipline data with the state and county data on Alex, we established Disruption on Campus and Threats/Intimidation as primary concerns. Our incidents per 100 students for Disruption on campus is .8, while the county is at .43. For Threats/Intimidation we have a 1 per 100 student average and the county has a .58 average. Our secondary concerns include physical attack, fighting, and battery. The administrative team will meet and discuss the disciplinary data quarterly to review progress. The school's culture and environment are positively reinforced through the school- wide house system, and implementations of SEL curriculums within the first 10 minutes of each school day. We have decided to re-implement PBIS this year to reinforce the house system. We have added one elementary school counselor in a proactive attempt to address the needs of the school. Restorative Practice Professional Development is offered and encouraged for all faculty and staff members.

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.

Improve the Culture for Learning and Student Readiness

- Implement school-wide SEL curriculum as a Tier 1 support for all students
- Modify and reinforce a school-wide behavior management system
- Leverage the “House System” to promote academic achievement

Develop additional opportunities for ESSA subgroups

- Implement co-teach model for ESE students and phase out self-contained
- Focus of ELL students by scheduling providers into small group rotations

Involve Families and Community

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

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

Administrators- Support teachers and fellow school leaders. Plan and provide training that will help and encourage teachers to create engaging and culturally- sensitive lessons. Plan for and implement the PBIS system with a committee that has clear and concise goals for all stakeholders. Delegate tasks to appropriate stakeholders that help students to develop a sense of social- emotional awareness and proper ways to cope with and express their social- emotional needs in a productive way. as well as make and reach realistic academic goals.

Teachers- Strengthen their teaching skills to develop engaging and culturally - sensitive lessons that encourage optimal learning. Develop and implement a way to track goals with students and parents. Inform parents of school events, classroom learning and social- emotional goals and ways they can participate both at home and school. Assist students to develop a sense of social- emotional awareness and proper ways to cope with and express their social- emotional needs in a productive way.

Staff- Strengthen skills related to their jobs, attend school events. When able, interact with students and encourage academic and social achievements. Assist students to develop a sense of social- emotional awareness and proper ways to cope with and express their social- emotional needs in a productive way.

Students- Attend school, encourage their families and peers to participate in school events. Make attainable learning goals (with the support of classroom teachers and parents). Develop a sense of social- emotional awareness and proper ways to cope with and express their social- emotional needs in a productive way. Encourage peers to make good choices and report any unsafe behaviors or situations.

Parents- attend school events, support student growth and celebrate achievement. Support learning goals throughout the year. Encourage social- skill building and practice.

Community Members-Expose students to the local careers and colleges that are available

All stakeholders will take part in the house system and gain points for their respective houses based on fulfilling their part of reaching our school goal for a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |