Holly Hill School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Voges J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%)
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	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Voges, Robert	Principal	
Glaenzer, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	
Henry, Derrick	Assistant Principal	
Dubrule, Lisa	Instructional Coach	
Friedman, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
Zablo, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Donald, Adrienne		
Olson, Andrew	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/14/2022, Robert Voges J

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
85

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,035

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
30

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
29

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	117	122	109	135	114	92	137	121	146	0	0	0	0	1093
Attendance below 90 percent	30	54	47	53	42	27	36	42	55	0	0	0	0	386
One or more suspensions	2	29	8	23	34	31	41	67	74	0	0	0	0	309
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	11	12	6	4	14	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	4	11	6	15	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	47	41	50	54	60	0	0	0	0	271
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	59	33	42	62	73	0	0	0	0	284
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	6	9	1	51	52	55	0	0	0	0	176

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	7	6	27	54	37	41	68	76	0	0	0	0	317

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	19	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/9/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	29%	49%	55%				35%	54%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	34%						43%	53%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						32%	44%	54%
Math Achievement	30%	32%	42%				34%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	50%						40%	52%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						36%	45%	52%
Science Achievement	44%	45%	54%				44%	61%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	52%	59%				56%	72%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	29%	58%	-29%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

				ELA		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
06	2022					
	2019	30%	50%	-20%	54%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
07	2022					
	2019	28%	47%	-19%	52%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	50%	-23%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	32%	60%	-28%	62%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	59%	-26%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
06	2022					
	2019	21%	48%	-27%	55%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
07	2022					
	2019	23%	47%	-24%	54%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
08	2022					
	2019	17%	29%	-12%	46%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	57%	-19%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	47%	68%	-21%	71%	-24%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	54%	36%	61%	29%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	5	20	28	5	42	49	16	31			
ELL	20	41	50	24	46	38	62	25			
BLK	22	30	22	22	47	54	29	49	50		
HSP	27	42	50	35	50	39	63	45			
MUL	36	27		38	58		50	82			
WHT	37	36	22	36	54	50	54	71	74		
FRL	27	33	25	28	48	47	42	55	74		

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			
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Learning gains in lowest quartile in math from 26% to 50%. Overall math learning gains grew from 35% to 50%.
ESSA subgroup of SWD 25 to 27% proficiency. Within SWD had substantial learning gains in math from 25 to 42. These gains in SWD represent the bulk of our learning gains.
African American student population went from 20% to 22% proficiency in math. In English Language Arts, they went from 26% to 22% proficiency.
Overall school math proficiency went up and English Language Arts went down.
Science and Civics had small increases in proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

English Language Arts (ELA) school-wide.
SWD population is the lowest performing subgroup representing approximately 20% of the HHK8 student population.

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

Attendance in classrooms with quality, benchmark-based instruction will give students the opportunity to learn and show proficiency. If they are not here to begin with, they cannot have those opportunities. Chronic absenteeism of 41.56% is 40% higher than the district. With truancies nearly double the average at 13.75% school wide compared to the district of 7.5%. Factors attributing to attendance in recent years are the pandemic, changes in lifestyles and work habits, school safety & security concerns, and public controversy. Furthermore, in attempt to meet the perceived needs of the community, the school has created systems and structures that foster a slow start to the school day and do not instill a sense of

urgency with regard to school attendance.

We will need to provide a safe and welcoming environment for all of our scholars and promote the value of an education at Holly Hill School. Parent communications will stress the importance of attendance and timeliness. Morning procedures will be revamped to facilitate a quick start to the classroom day while maintaining campus security.

Educators must reach out to the community and ensure all of our students have the opportunity to get to school. Once on campus, students must remain in class and participate in a safe and engaging learning environment.

Teachers must provide high quality benchmark based instruction that is engaging and rigorously aligned.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Mathematics Learning Gains to 50% from 40%.
LQ Mathematics Learning Gains to 50% from 36%

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

Talented faculty under the direction of academic coaches utilizing PLCs, collaborative planning, intervention teachers, and a "math lab" opportunity integrated into the master schedule. Utilization of the MTSS process to support all learners.

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

Continue the same approach to coaching and collaboration with an emphasis on instructional practice aligned to the benchmarks. Emphasis will be on tiered coaching at all levels of the school leadership team.

Adapt a similar team approach to our ELA and Reading curriculum and pedagogy.

Deliver benchmark-aligned instruction in every classroom

Utilize Collaborative Planning

MTSS supports made explicit in daily work including PST, PLC, and SLT

Develop additional opportunities for ESSA Subgroups, specifically SWD.

Emphasis on Attendance

Re-engagement of community partners and families.

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.

MTSS Professional Learning with district support; AVID Learning strategies for all students; MS Teaming, PBIS/4-House System;

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

A Parent/Community Liaison will be funded through Title 1 to support family non-instructional needs and enhance community involvement.

Intervention Teachers and Academic Coach funded through Title 1 to support strategies and initiatives.

A Dual-Language VPK program has been initiated to serve the needs of the community.

Re-birth of PTSA to strengthen community ties.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our Area of Focus is aligned to the VCS District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. Benchmark-Based Planning & Instruction FSA data indicates a need to increase fidelity in instructional practice in standards aligned instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By December, 2022, teachers will be implementing 70% of classroom look-fors related to benchmark based planning and instruction during instructional learning walks of classrooms and PLCs. By May of 2023, students will increase proficiency in ELA, Math, Civics and Science for all students. At least 40% of all students at Holly Hill School will achieve proficiency on Annual Progress Monitoring 3 in the spring of 2023. At least 60% will show proficiency on Science and Civics EOY Assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Through structured PLC, Collaborative Planning, and Leadership Meetings aligned to implementing and monitoring benchmark-based instruction. Calendars and agendas will become artifacts and evidence of the journey towards outcomes. Data-driven decisions based on our areas of focus are driven by a Stock Take process that permeates the school. Leaders will use curriculum maps and other tools aligned to current benchmarks and standards when walking classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Zablo (mgzablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collective Teacher Efficacy (CTE) through the bench-mark aligned planning of Professional Learning Communities and their Collaborative Planning supported by tiered academic coaching and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Collective teacher efficacy (CTE) refers to a shared belief that the school's staff can have a positive impact on student achievement – despite other influences in the students' lives that challenge their success. It is evident when teachers see themselves as part of a team (PLC) working for their students. They believe in their collective ability to lead the improvement of student outcomes and higher levels of achievement result. In addition, student behavior improves. (Donohoo, 2018). The Effect size of CTE is 1.57, more than double the effect of feedback (.72) and three times bigger than clas management (.52) according to Hattie's Visible Learning research (2016) Donohoo, J., Hattie, J. & Eells, R. (2018) The power of collective Efficacy. Educational Leadership Vol 75 No 6 ASCD Hattie, J.(2016). Third Visible Learning Annual Conference: Mindframes and Maximizers, Washington, DC, July 11, 2016.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Content coaches will facilitate benchmark-aligned planning by:

-train teachers on collaborative planning expectations

-assigning grade levels to coaches/admin/TOAs for monitoring and assigned location

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

-Master schedule

-Admin, coaches, and teachers attend content planning sessions

- clearly communicate the expectations for planning

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaches will assist in the planning process by identifying and planning for the supports that teachers will need. Tiered Coaching.

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

Teachers will understand the process for expectations for planning (i.e. preview identified benchmark). Use of DOE BSI Framework for Planning.

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. Students With Disabilities (SWD) represent the lowest rated ESSA subgroup and these students show low levels of learning proficiency. They represent approximately 20% of our school population.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Holly Hill School will maintain 100% compliance with FTE items specifically related to SWD and ELL and earn an "A" on the internal audit. Walk-throughs by instructional leaders will evidence use of MTSS look-fors and adherence to student IEPs in 90% of classrooms visited by mid-year. By May of 2023, SWD will increase proficiency in ELA, Math, Civics and Science. At least 40% of all students at Holly Hill School will achieve proficiency on Annual Progress Monitoring 3 in the spring of 2023. At least 60% will show proficiency on Science and Civics EOY Assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through structured PLC, Collaborative Planning, and Leadership Meetings monitoring MTSS at Holly Hill School. Calendars and agendas will become artifacts and evidence of the journey towards outcomes. Data-driven decisions based on our areas of focus are driven by a Stock Take process that permeates the school. Leaders will conduct frequent walk-throughs of classrooms, meetings, and documents to determine use of MTSS campus-wide. Live Virtual Wall of Students monitoring as well as weekly PLC Room whiteboard wall activity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Multi-Tiered System of Support utilizing positive behavioral support systems beginning with tier 1 core instruction, tier 2 targeted-group interventions, and tier 3 Intensive Individual Interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a collaborative, evidence-based approach to differentiating and personalizing instruction and intervention, across academics, social-emotional learning, and behavior for all students—so that every student can achieve academic and life success. MTSS aims to provide an equitable educational experience by leveraging collective knowledge and expertise to help teachers understand their learners' needs and make informed and strategic decisions that best support them.

resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor practices, reports and audits to ensure all students receive prescribed services and Holly Hill educators are in compliance with VCS District ESE protocol (IDEA/DOJ/504)

Person Responsible
Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning to include focus on students with disabilities in general education classroom and meeting the mandates of IDEA and DOJ

Person Responsible
Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identification of students and placement in tiers 1, 2, or 3; alignment of interventions and strategies

Person Responsible
Beverly Gadson (bgadson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

FTE Compliance, Documentation, and Audit.

Person Responsible
Michael Zablo (mgzablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

"Virtual Student Wall" of student data and PLC Room "Wall of Data" updated weekly

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Safety and Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS)	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Safety is fundamental to all other aspects of school Culture and Environment. Students must be safe to feel safe and want to come to school. Safety begins with campus security and extends to an individual's personal sense of belonging at Holly Hill School. Poor attendance and behaviors are often manifestations of a less than safe, healthy, or supportive environment. Holly Hill School's Chronic Absenteeism at 41% is 30% ahead of district average and climbing. Attendance = Absence & Tardy - create a sense of urgency to be on campus and in class. Student behaviors, such as aggression, have increased in recent years as indicated by increases in Office Discipline Referrals for offenses such as fighting, hitting & striking, insubordination, or disruption. Additionally, district data shows disproportionate discipline of minority students and students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will utilize PBIS Implementation Checklist data & Benchmarks of Quality data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing Discipline Referrals and suspensions of all student subgroups. Mid-year walk-thrus will evidence 90% use of the house system in classrooms and public areas of campus.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS planning team and by the school based PBIS PLCs on a monthly basis. Virtual Wall of students monitored as well as PLC Room wall. Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the PBIS District Coordinator, Dr. Mandy Ellzey, following the close of the reporting windows for fall reporting, spring reporting and year end. This data will also be monitored by the PBIS teams to be used for progress monitoring and planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derrick Henry (dlhenry@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through district-wide MTSS framework.

Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making. Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). These assessments contains 53-items divided into ten critical elements that make up an effective PBIS Tier 1 system. Completion of the BoQ produces scale and subscale scores indicating the extent to which these critical elements are in place.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures. House systems and structures.

Person Responsible	Derrick Henry (dlhenry@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLCs and Collaborative Planning Work closely follow Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and utilize the house system when practical.

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

Revive House Council Establish a Year-at-a-Glance 2022-23 SY for monthly PBIS Goals and activities.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data at SLT
Weekly review at student services, administration, and coaches meetings.

Person Responsible	Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist
Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist
End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

Person Responsible	Derrick Henry (dlhenry@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Improve attendance through change in morning procedures and creation of a sense of urgency among stakeholders.

Person Responsible Robert Voges (rjvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In our primary grades students took the i-Ready diagnostic assessment 3 times throughout the 21-22 school year. The final data from Diagnostic 3 was as follows:
Kindergarten - 0% of students were Tier 3, 30% of students were Tier 2, while 70% were Tier 1; Phonics, High Frequency, Vocabulary and Informational comprehension showed 30% or higher placed within the Tier 2 level in the final diagnostic.
First Grade - 4% Tier 3, 44% Tier 2, and 52% were Tier 1; Phonics, vocabulary, and both informational and literary comprehension strands showed 40% or higher placed within the Tier 2 level in the final diagnostic.
Second Grade - 27% Tier 3, 33% Tier 2, 40% Tier 1 overall placement. Phonics, vocabulary and comprehension in both literary and informational text are concerns as more than 50% of students assessed fell within the Tier 2/Tier 3 placement on the final diagnostic.
Grade level data points analyzed found that 2nd grade Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA will be an area of focus during the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 50%, ELA Learning Gains were 52%, and the Lowest Quartile performed at 40%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and ELL which performed at 22% and 23%

respectively.

FSA Scores:
Grade 3 ELA percent proficient= 23%
Grade 4 ELA percent proficient= 30%
Grade 5 ELA percent proficient= 29%
Third grade was found to have performed below the 50% proficiency threshold on the statewide English Language Arts Assessment. As a result of student performance below both the district and state averages it was determined that Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA to be an Area of Focus during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Walk-throughs by leadership will result in 80% look-fors being present by December 2022.

By May of 2023, K-2 students will increase their proficiency in ELA. At least 50% will achieve proficiency on Annual Progress Monitoring 3 in the spring of 2023.

Grades K-2 ELA student proficiency will increase overall during the 2022-2023 school year. The newly implemented progress monitoring (F.A.S.T.) assessment data will show an increase in student proficiency from Assessment 1 to Assessment 3. 50% or higher of students in first and second grade will be proficient by assessment 3 of the FAST.
The goal is for each of the three grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency during the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Walk-throughs by leadership will result in 80% look-fors being present by December 2022.

By May of 2023, 3-5 students will increase their proficiency in ELA. At least 50% will achieve proficiency on Annual Progress Monitoring 3 in the spring of 2023.

Grades 3-5 ELA student proficiency will increase overall from 28% to 50%. Individual grade levels will increase overall student proficiency:
3rd grade from 23% to 50%
4th grade from 30% to 50%
5th grade from 29% to 50%
The goal is for each of the three grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency during the 2022-2023 school year and to achieve a minimum of two grade levels with 50% or more students performing at proficiency.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through bi-weekly classroom visits using a walkthrough tool with specific standard aligned ELA look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments designed weekly during collaborative planning to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom visits and student performance data. Feedback will be given weekly upon classroom visits to include, but not limited to the use of learning targets, success criteria, student activity versus teacher activity, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dubrule, Lisa, ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our evidence- based strategy is to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate differentiated standards-aligned instruction for small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership- benchmark-aligned instruction will be used to promote a culture of literacy and will be monitored to ensure all students are exposed to grade level tasks. Literacy Coaching- ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on understanding newly implemented benchmarks. The ELA Coach will provide support with delivery of instruction, lesson modeling, and planning in collaborative planning. Assessment- use of collaborative planning structures will help teachers assess their understanding of benchmarks and reflect on benchmark aligned instruction. Professional Learning- Teachers will continue to engage in Professional Learning to deepen their understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and practices designed to enhance student mastery of the content/concepts taught.	Dubrule, Lisa, ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership - Data Analysis: monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and Monthly School Leadership Team Meetings. Academic Coach, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and 3 students through progress monitoring will occur and instructional decisions made to increase student achievement. Literacy Coaching- ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on identifying leveled groups based on benchmarks not mastered. In addition, the Intervention teacher will work with Tier 2 & 3 students to remediate areas of focus. Assessment- Unit Assessments will be administered after each unit. Assessment results will be progress monitored by administration. Professional Learning- Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during ERPLs on the MTSS process to learn structures and strategies to improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and student achievement.	Dubrule, Lisa, ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership- Calibration Walks/Learning will help ensure benchmark and tasks alignment. Calibration Walks/Learning Walks will promote a culture of literacy for both teachers and students. Feedback about frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks will be shared with teachers. Literacy Coaching- School Leadership/District Specialists will provide coaching and feedback to teachers focused on school-wide lookfors: frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks. Teachers will engage in Coaching Cycles and feedback will be provided by the ELA Coach as well. Assessment- District Assessments will be administered after each unit. Assessment results will be progress monitored by administration and teachers during PLCs. Professional Learning- Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during PLCs and Collaborative Planning focused on Differentiated Instruction and how to strategically group students based on skills/benchmarks not mastered.	Friedman, Stephanie, snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The typical Holly Hill School scholar is not transient and spends the majority of their K-8 years with us as a Knight. Often, they are the children and grandchildren of Holly Hill School Alumni. There is a strong, passionate culture of tradition that runs deep among Holly Hill Stakeholders. Honoring those traditions and this unique town is where we begin, especially as demographic shifts bring new friends to our neighborhood.

Holly Hill School uses the house system to build a positive culture and environment for our scholars. "Four houses: One school." Our house system is a Positive Behavioral Intervention System (PBIS), instills a restorative growth mindset, and provides a sense of belonging for our scholars and stakeholders. In addition, we have implemented school-wide SEL curriculum as a Tier 1 support for all students, mentoring and student leadership opportunities through AVID and House Council. Students, teachers, and community partners who are new to Holly Hill are selected by their houses through random drawings and remain in their respective house for life. As students transition to the secondary grades, they are assigned to teams designed to improve the Culture for Learning and Student Readiness of our secondary scholars.

In addition to leveraging our House Systems for academic achievement in support of our complete MTSS framework, we are continuing to enhance and deepen the involvement of Families and Community. 2023 SY Action Steps: Parent/Community Liaison position funded; Holly Hill School PTSA Re-Launch; Deliberate effort to invite parents, business partners, PTSA, and community to all school events; Broaden our partnership with area businesses and manufactures; More events on campus - music, art, STEM, Literacy, Fun; Expose students to the local careers and colleges that are a available through AVID and other opportunities;

We have clubs for students including media lunch bunch, Girls on the Run, Robotics, STEM, Garden Club, Art Club, Battle of the Books, Math Counts, Cross Country, Basketball, Band, Chorus, Dance, and Cheer. The Lohman MOAS field study, Tallahassee 7th Grade Trip; Washington DC 8th Grade Trip; and Marine Discovery Center afford our scholars real-world opportunities to learn off campus.

Holly Hill School's School Advisory Council (SAC) meets monthly to review the school improvement plan, school vision, improvement areas of focus, spending of certain funds to support student needs. The SAC is composed of teachers, parents, business partners, and community members including our mayor, police chief, and school board member.

Our House Council is a subset of our leadership team that includes student representatives from each house. Student voice is always blended with other stakeholder voices when making decisions regarding our school.

We have also launched a Dual-language (Spanish) VPK program to meet the needs of our growing community and plan to move it through the grade levels to support these young learners. We are also enhancing opportunities for ELL students and making deliberate efforts to hire additional bi-lingual educators and support positions to meet student needs and provide an enhanced sense of belonging on our campus. We have begun the motto: "Este Escuela es Nuestra Escuela".

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

Our SAC meets monthly as will our newly revitalized PTSA. Both groups will assess school needs and allocate support as available to support school improvement and do what is best for students. Our School Leadership team consists of teachers and administrators and meets monthly to monitor the school's improvement plan areas of focus. In addition, the House Council meets monthly to facilitate the house system and inject student voice into promoting a positive culture and environment. Administrators, academic coaches, counselors, and teachers meet weekly and deliberately to monitor implementation of our school improvement plan and MTSS framework for academics, behavior and social emotional learning.

The leadership team meets at least once per month to identify needs our student population. When migrant children enroll the staff ensures that student receive a fair and equitable opportunity to achieve high-quality education and assistance transitioning to post-secondary education or employment.

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.