

Volusia County Schools

Silver Sands Middle 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

Demographics

Principal: Rick Inge

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	99%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) Middle School 6-8	2020-21 Title I School Yes	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 36%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

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.

Silver Sands is committed to building individual character and achievement by linking learning to life through real world applications.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Silver Sands Middle School follows the vision statement of Volusia County Schools. Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Jackson, Susan	Assistant Principal	
Circelli , Cindy	Instructional Coach	
Carignan, Tim	Dean	SAC Chair
Alligood, Kevin	Teacher, K-12	SAC member
Rudd, Madison	Teacher, K-12	
Cisneros, Christian	Teacher, ESE	
Carlisle, Travis	Math Coach	
Boss, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	
Inge, Rick	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/21/2021, Rick Inge

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

70

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.

23

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	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	425	405	456	0	0	0	0	1286
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	79	85	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	41	39	0	0	0	0	109
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	17	53	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	87	125	0	0	0	0	304
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	116	140	0	0	0	0	376
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	16	0	0	0	0	40

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	65	62	83	0	0	0	0	210

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	20	13	17	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	378	372	362	0	0	0	0	1112
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	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	66	66	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	79	61	0	0	0	0	215

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	39	56	39	0	0	0	0	134

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	378	372	362	0	0	0	0	1112
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	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	66	66	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	79	61	0	0	0	0	215

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	39	56	39	0	0	0	0	134

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5

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				58%	51%	54%	58%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	51%	54%	58%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	42%	47%	48%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				66%	54%	58%	62%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains				57%	51%	57%	60%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	42%	51%	49%	46%	51%
Science Achievement				65%	58%	51%	67%	61%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	71%	72%	74%	69%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	56%	50%	6%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2021					
	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	47%	16%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	45%	29%	16%	46%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	48%	15%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	68%	11%	71%	8%

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	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 6 - LA = DIA 1-3, VLT 1-3/ Math = DIA 1-5/ Science = DIA 1-8

Grade 7 - LA = DIA 1-3, VLT 1-3/ Math = DIA 1-5/ Science = DIA 1-7/ Civics DIA 1-8

Grade 8 - LA = DIA 1-3, VLT 1-3/ Math = DIA 1-4, Alg DIA 1-6, Geom DIA 1-5/ Science = DIA 1-6

All measurements are in percent of students proficient (70% or above)

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	641/34	657/30	344/12
	Economically Disadvantaged	466/27	481/24	249/7
	Students With Disabilities	110/12	109/6	61/3
	English Language Learners	25/16	26/23	14/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	639/29	626/7	98/27
	Economically Disadvantaged	463/22	458/5	74/30
	Students With Disabilities	112/11	111/3	5/0
	English Language Learners	24/25	25/0	7/14

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	621/35	656/51	340/28
	Economically Disadvantaged	412/30	440/43	221/21
	Students With Disabilities	93/9	98/28	60/5
	English Language Learners	38/26	40/53	22/18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	680/14	442/18	66/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	457/11	281/11	26/42
	Students With Disabilities	107/1	64/3	2/0
	English Language Learners	40/8	23/9	4/50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	308/42	568/43	1085/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	215/38	378/37	696/43
	Students With Disabilities	48/19	95/13	157/23
	English Language Learners	19/37	35/29	73/27

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	547/48	664/53	351/13
	Economically Disadvantaged	385/42	434/48	225/13
	Students With Disabilities	90/19	101/30	55/0
	English Language Learners	18/33	21/48	10/10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	486/15	308/44	332/15
	Economically Disadvantaged	320/13	156/42	212/13
	Students With Disabilities	80/5	4/75	54/2
	English Language Learners	17/18	11/55	11/27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	647/66	686/53	697/74
	Economically Disadvantaged	418/60	446/47	447/69
	Students With Disabilities	109/34	112/21	112/48
	English Language Learners	20/50	20/50	22/64

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	18	27	18	19	31	32	27	43	17		
ELL	35	46	32	28	24	18		45	73		
ASN	74	70		66	48			77	86		
BLK	31	37	22	22	25	18	35	48	64		
HSP	46	45	24	39	38	25	50	56	75		
MUL	54	59		50	38		53	75	83		
WHT	58	49	31	56	47	38	67	72	80		
FRL	46	42	24	42	38	30	56	58	72		
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	22	40	38	30	42	36	30	51	29		
ELL	27	50	47	47	59	63	20	80			

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
ASN	71	65		88	63			100	100		
BLK	37	48	51	46	50	43	33	67	89		
HSP	53	56	50	59	66	65	59	68	79		
MUL	52	54	38	55	49	50	69	77	82		
WHT	62	57	48	70	58	54	70	84	80		
FRL	50	51	40	60	54	51	58	74	76		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	45	44	35	54	44	33	54			
ELL	20	35	27	20	42	40					
ASN	85	82		88	81		100		93		
BLK	41	58	56	42	53	46	40	61	84		
HSP	55	59	52	48	49	38	55	64	73		
MUL	60	50	38	60	57	23	84	69	89		
WHT	60	57	45	66	62	55	71	78	76		
FRL	52	55	46	55	59	48	60	70	70		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	39
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
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	43
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	59
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	55
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	45
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?

Throughout all grade levels and subject areas of ELA and Matj our lowest quartile learning gains decreased. We dropped in ELA from 47% to 28%, in Math from 52% to 31%. Our greatest area of deficit is mathematics.

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

Math achievement levels and learning gains for lowest quartile/ESSA subgroups need to improve. We are below 40% proficiency in Math.

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

The contributing factors for decreased learning gains include attendance concerns, quarantines, students attending the Volusia Live platform from home and discipline removals from class.

This year we have implemented 6th grade Teams to improve morale and a sense of community. We will begin PST processes early in the school year. We will have Warrior time for needed interventions, remediation, and enrichment.

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

The acceleration points earned by SSM were outstanding (79). Overall achievement in SS and Science is on target (55 and 62 respectively).

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

SSM has a strong CTE program and many students who are not taking a high school math class enter the Digital Tools high school class.

Our SS and Science departments work cohesively and cooperatively to assist in student achievement by teaching rigorous standards.

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

We will begin standards based tracking and data discussions weekly during PLCs.

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.

Our teachers will participate in professional learning for engaging students and rigorous high level questioning techniques

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

AVID strategies will be implemented and shared in all PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Standards aligned instruction was an area of deficit in district data walks. Not all teachers are aligning standards to the concepts taught daily. Students need to know what they are learning. This became evident from district data walks.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA overall proficiency from 54% to 58%.
Increase ELA learning gains from the lowest quartile from 28% to 41%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rick Inge (rringe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy is Teacher Clarity which is both a method and a mindset and has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie 2009).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher clarity is teaching that is organized and intentional It brings a forthrightness and fairness to the classroom because student learning is based on transparent expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and academic coaches will monitor the posting of standards in each class. Teachers will be trained on Teacher Clarity and the importance of not only posting standards, learning targets and success criteria but discussing these concepts with students daily. These components will also be discussed regularly in weekly PLCs.

Person Responsible Cindy Circelli (cecircel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Students will be able to tell administrators what they are learning and how they know they are successful during walkthroughs

Person Responsible Susan Jackson (stjacks1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our overall math achievement this year was 50% and was our lowest area of all subject areas. Our learning gains dropped 14% and our lowest quartile learning gains dropped 21%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase overall math proficiency from 50% to 54%.
 Increase our learning gains from 43% to 54%.
 Increase our lowest quartile learning gains from 31% to 41%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations and drop ins using the walk-through tool with specific math "look fors" and conducting weekly data chats during PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Travis Carlisle (tjcarlis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy that we will implement this year is Math Talk (class discussion) which has an effect size of 0.82 (Hattie 2017).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Math Talk is a meta-cognition strategy where students explain their thinking and critically analyze others' thinking, testing if it is efficient and effective.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers in math classes and in other classes where math is used, will discuss the strategies used aloud. Students will have opportunities daily to share and explain the strategies they used to solve problems. Peers will assist in questioning or clarifying strategies used aloud.

Math teachers will be trained on the use of Math Talks and discuss during PLCS.

Person Responsible Travis Carlisle (tjcarlis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Students will explain to administrators and coaches how they solved problems during walk throughs and drop ins

Person Responsible Susan Jackson (stjacks1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus aligns to our strategic plan goal #1 to engage all students in rigorous learning. Our ESSA subgroups that performed below 41% proficient were both students with disabilities and black/African-Americans.

Measurable Outcome: Increase our two ESSA subgroups (stated above) to 41% or above.

Monitoring: Teachers will be trained on effective student feedback where students give feedback to the teacher on what they know, what they understand, where they are making errors when they don't understand and when they choose to disengage. Administrators and coaches will monitor this interventions during frequent walkthroughs and drop ins.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christian Cisneros (cdcisner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy of using effective student feedback has a 0.73 effect size (Hattie 2009). The greatest impact of feedback occurs when it is supported by effective teaching and learning strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Effective feedback will help teachers and students develop relationships while providing interventions to students in need.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will meet with students regularly to have data chats in order to apply effective feedback.

All teachers will be trained on using effective feedback strategies, discussions and strategies will be discussed weekly during PLCs.

Person Responsible Cindy Circelli (cecircel@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 school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we identified that SSM reported 8.3/100 students which is considered very high. Our statewide rating is 483 out of 553 and our county rating is 9 out of 12. The suspension rate at SSM is higher (24.8) than the statewide rate (18.3). An area of concern that we will focus on is fighting and vaping.

We will develop a schoolwide CHAMPS behavior plan and implement a mentoring program.

We now have two deans of student relations who will work to ensure the safety of all students through implementing conflict resolution strategies school management procedures. We will also examine our discipline data monthly in our PLCs.

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.

Our expectation for all teachers this year is to be consistent with our schoolwide policies and procedures. Students will understand the expectations from all is the same. We will show all students that we care about their success through developing relationships, helping with conflict resolution and praising often.

Meetings were held with parents, community members, teachers, support staff, and students during the summer to gain information regarding their impressions of the school culture. Each group indicated a need to increase communication between the principal and those groups. The principal updated the school website, which had not been updated in over a year. He also created a Remind notification to staff regarding upcoming events. The principal has also sent out a dozen School Messenger calls since the beginning of the year to impacted families dealing with COVID-19. As a follow-up, since the beginning of the year the principal has met with over one-hundred students. These students identified two things as being the main cause for stress on the school culture and environment: fighting and bullying. Title 1 funds were used to create a Social Emotional Learning Teacher on Assignment position. The person hired for this position will meet specifically with female students to help bring about resolutions to issues they are having with others before they become a major disruption. The school does not currently have a Parent/Teacher Organization (PTO, PTA, PTSA). Plans are to reestablish one of these groups during this school year.

To facilitate a more positive culture in sixth grade, all students have been assigned to one of three teams: Warrior Influencers, Warrior Believers, and Warrior AVID Dreamers. Students on these teams share the same English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies teachers. It has created a School Within a School environment. Competitions have begun between the teams to help boost student moral and desire to be at school.

Finally, seventh and eighth grade students commented that Silver Sands Middle School was a “regular” school. Most did not feel as though we offered any special programs or activities for students. This could be due to the restrictions placed on us last year by COVID-19. However, to facilitate a process where these students can be more involved we have created three academies: Community Involvement Academy, Agri-Science Academy, and Performing Arts Academy. Students in these academies will represent our school in local, regional and state competitions. Moving forward, we have plans to create additional academies for 2022-23, possibly creating a few during the second semester of this school year.

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

- Administration - monitor campus, classes and build relationships with all along the way
- Teachers - consistently provide class management and academic interventions to help all students succeed.
- Academic coaches/intervention teachers - assist teachers to develop strategies for students needing more assistance.
- Clerical staff, custodial staff, bus drivers - greet all and develop relationships

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00