

Volusia County Schools

Campbell Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Campbell Middle School

625 S KEECH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Matthews

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2021

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2019-20 Status (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 |
| 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: D (40%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | CSI |
| * 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Campbell Middle School

625 S KEECH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Middle School 6-8 | 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 | 84% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D | | C | C |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Matthews, Kimberly | Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Kelleher, Al | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Rushing, Christopher | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Owens, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader for Students with Disabilities |
| Holcombe, Sierra | Math Coach | Math Instructional Leader |
| Shaughnessy, Shawnda | Other | Social Emotional Teacher on Assignment |
| Ray, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | Lead Teacher for English |
| Williamson, Taneshia | Teacher, K-12 | Science Intervention Leader |
| Brown, Ariel | Teacher, K-12 | Social Studies Lead Teacher |
| Anderson, Teresa | Teacher, K-12 | Lead Teacher for Students with Disabilities |
| Travis, Derek | Dean | PBIS Lead Teacher |
| Mills, Jennifer | School Counselor | MTSS School Counselor Lead |
| Fordham, Harriet | Teacher, K-12 | Reading Intervention Lead Teacher |
| Pelham, Dewayne | Teacher, K-12 | PBIS Co-Chair Lead Teacher |
| Gattis, LeRoy | Other | Math Intervention Teacher |
| Powell, Tamara | Teacher, K-12 | AVID |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/31/2021, Kimberly Matthews

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.*

0

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

945

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

17

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

14

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 | 266 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 836 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 59 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 119 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 75 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 33 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 143 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 419 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 126 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 381 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 99 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 325 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 134 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 393 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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% | 45% | 50% | | | | 32% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 34% | | | | | | 44% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 26% | | | | | | 44% | 42% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 30% | 31% | 36% | | | | 28% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 46% | | | | | | 36% | 51% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | | | | | | 33% | 42% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 29% | 46% | 53% | | | | 34% | 58% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 50% | 49% | 58% | | | | 63% | 71% | 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 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 50% | -18% | 54% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 47% | -20% | 52% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 50% | -17% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 48% | -21% | 55% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 22% | 47% | -25% | 54% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 15% | 29% | -14% | 46% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -22% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 57% | -26% | 48% | -17% |
| 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 | 60% | 68% | -8% | 71% | -11% |
| 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 | 82% | 54% | 28% | 61% | 21% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 92% | 55% | 37% | 57% | 35% |

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 | 13 | 12 | 8 | 32 | 34 | 2 | 23 | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 28 | 20 | 6 | 50 | 60 | 14 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 32 | 25 | 25 | 42 | 39 | 27 | 46 | 71 | | |
| HSP | 28 | 39 | 38 | 27 | 54 | 63 | 20 | 40 | | | |
| MUL | 44 | 28 | | 37 | 53 | | 27 | 67 | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 42 | 25 | 46 | 55 | 67 | 40 | 62 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 28 | 33 | 26 | 29 | 45 | 44 | 27 | 49 | 72 | | |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 8 | 21 | 19 | 7 | 32 | 39 | 13 | 15 | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 29 | 23 | 7 | 28 | 55 | 9 | 45 | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 30 | 22 | 20 | 36 | 41 | 24 | 57 | 62 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 34 | 42 | 54 | 33 | 26 | | 36 | 42 | 70 | | |
| MUL | 42 | 50 | | 39 | 48 | | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 49 | 20 | 48 | 49 | | 65 | 65 | 67 | | |
| FRL | 29 | 35 | 26 | 26 | 37 | 41 | 33 | 57 | 64 | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 5 | 39 | 42 | 8 | 30 | 32 | 3 | 32 | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 55 | 64 | 12 | 17 | 8 | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 40 | 41 | 22 | 35 | 35 | 26 | 60 | 75 | | |
| HSP | 39 | 54 | 53 | 32 | 33 | 17 | 36 | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 39 | 47 | | 38 | 29 | | | 58 | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 57 | 57 | 46 | 47 | 57 | 70 | 77 | 83 | | |
| FRL | 30 | 43 | 42 | 26 | 35 | 34 | 32 | 61 | 76 | | |

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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 408 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 16 |
| 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 | 30 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | 37 |
| 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 | 39 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 43 |
| 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 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 39 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

Overall, Campbell Middle school had a decrease or remained the same in learning gains, lower quartile, and proficiency in ELA. ELA Proficiency was at 29% (decrease 2% from 2020-2021), ELA Learning Gains was at 34% (decrease 2% from 2020-2021), and the Lowest Quartile performed at 26% (stayed the same from 2020-2021). Overall, in math we had an increase in learning gains, lower quartile, and proficiency. Our Math Proficiency was at 30% (increase 2% from 2020-2021), Math Learning Gains was at 46% (increase 8% from 2020-2021), and the Lowest Quartile performed at 43% (increase 1% from 2020-2021). Our science proficiency was 29% (decrease 8% from 2020-2021). Our civics proficiency was at 50% (decreased 7% from 2020-2021). Our acceleration percentage was 70% (increased 5% from 2020-2021).

Sixth grade increase proficiency in both ELA 30% (increase 2% from 2020-2021) and Math 30% (increase 11% from 2020-2021). Seventh grade decreased proficiency in both ELA (decrease 2% from 2020-2021) and Math (decrease 4% from 2020-2021). Eighth grades decreased proficiency in ELA 25% (decrease 11% from 2020-2021) and Math 12% (decrease 9% from 2020-2021).

Further analysis has revealed that most of the students in our LQ were also in our targeted ESSA subgroups: Student with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American students, Hispanic students, and economically disadvantaged students.

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

Overall proficiency in ELA, Science, and Civics are our greatest need for improvement. In addition, eighth grades proficiency in ELA 25% (decrease 11% from 2020-2021), Math 12% (decrease 9% from 2020-2021) and Science 29% (decrease 8% from 2020-2021) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement for a grade level.

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

Some factors contributing to lower achievement include teacher turnover, new teachers, lack of effective teaching practices, and consistent standards-based instruction. Another factor that contributed to the decrease in student achievement were COVID-related factors such as teacher absences, and student quarantines. There were also long term vacancies in Civics and eighth grade science.

New actions could include additional support from site-based and district-based coaches, strengthening

the PLC process, planning using standards-based instruction, and creating a culture where teachers and students want to be here, feel valued, and are incentivized for positive behavior.

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

Math learning gains showed tremendous improvement, from 38% to 46%. In addition, sixth grades proficiency in Math 30% (increase 11% from 2020-2021) and ELA (increased 2% from 2020 – 2021) demonstrate the greatest improvement for a grade level.

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

Some contributing factors were strong instructional coaching in math, effective data-driven PLC process, consistency in math department, frequent coaching and feedback provided by the math coach.

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

The strategies that need to be implemented to improve student achievement include standards-based instruction, multi-tiered system of supports, teaming and positive behavioral interventions and supports. PLC structures will be implemented and there will be time for collaborative planning. New teachers will be paired with a mentor teacher and will also be supported by the Curriculum AP. PENDA(Science) and Core Connections(English) programs will be implemented this school year. The Math Coach will also work with select teachers during coaching cycles.

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

Focus on professional development will be in job-embedded opportunities. These include ongoing and effective PLC's focused on standard-based instructions, frequent observation, and feedback through both VSET and One Note, and use of ERPL time focused on MTSS/Teaming/PBIS, and implementation of AVID strategies. There will also be additional training for teachers for PENDA and Core Connections.

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

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

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.

There is a critical need to engage all students in high levels of instruction. Instructional Practice specifically related to standards aligned instruction. Based on school report card data, our ELA Proficiency was at 29% (decrease 2% from 2020-2021), ELA Learning Gains was at 34% (decrease 2% from 2020-2021), ELA Lowest Quartile performed at 26% (stayed the same from 2020-2021), Math Proficiency was at 30% (increase 2% from 2020-2021), Math Learning Gains was at 46% (increase 8% from 2020-2021), Math Lowest Quartile performed at 43% (increase 1% from 2020-2021), Science proficiency was 29% (decrease 8% from 2020-2021), and our Civics proficiency was at 50% (decreased 7% from 2020-2021).

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By mid-year of the 2022-2023 school year, 35% of students will be proficient in ELA. At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 41% of students will be proficient in ELA. By mid-year of the 2022-2023 school year, 36% of students will be proficient in Math. At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 42% of students will be proficient in Math. By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 41% of students will be proficient in Science. By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 63% of students will be proficient in Civics. Walk-through data will be collected for alignment for standards-based instruction. By December of 2023, Teachers will be implementing identified look-fors 80% of the time. The Math Coach will have select teachers on coaching cycles. By March 2023, the number of Tier 2 and Tier 3 coaching supports will decrease by 75%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will have teachers plan instruction that will support delivery of concepts and skills that are aligned to the benchmarks. We will monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning with walkthroughs and PLCS. We will use student data and work samples to identify learning needs in order to adjust instruction. A walk-through tool in Microsoft forms will be used to collect evidence of look-fors and provide feedback to teachers/administrators. PLCS will upload meeting minutes with next steps into Microsoft Teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Matthews (kdmattthe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Teacher clarity with an emphasis on the utilization of researched based practices, standards aligned instruction, small group instruction, differentiation, focus boards, and coaching support in the classroom.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy: The rationale for using the strategy of standards-based instruction is that all educational stakeholders must align to high rigorous standards of instruction to increase overall student achievement in ELA. John Hattie's effect sizes of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57, teacher clarity .84, setting standards for self judgement .62, comprehensive instructional programs for teachers are .72, learning goals vs no learning goals .68, and teacher feedback .76. Research on standards-based instruction have been conducted by the Florida Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers, and Learning Sciences Marzano Center which recommend standards-based instruction to increase student success rate.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the 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.

Create a master schedule that allows for weekly content area planning.
Identify and protect time for administration, coaches, and teachers to attend each content planning session.

Person Responsible Al Kelleher (apkelleh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Define roles and responsibilities of team members (coaches, teachers, administrators, district) for before, during and after PLC sessions.

Develop content area Planning Protocols that will delineate expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices.

Clearly communicate the expectations for PLCs with coaches and teachers.

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

Collaborate with instructional leadership team to discuss data, monitor student progress, and plan for content area PLCs.

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

Prepare for the planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.

During planning, focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.

Person Responsible Sierra Holcombe (smholcom@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create and communicate walk-through tool with Look-Fors with teacher feedback.

Person Responsible Sierra Holcombe (smholcom@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Design a schedule for academic intervention teachers to support each grade level/subject area.

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Person Responsible | Shawnda Shaughnessy (sashaugh@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. | <p>There is a critical need to engage all students in high levels of instruction for ESSA subgroups. Instructional Practice specifically related to standards aligned instruction for Students With Disabilities. Based on school report card data, our SWD Proficiency in ELA was 5%(decrease of 3% from 2020-2021), SWD ELA Learning Gains was at 13% (decrease of 8% from 2020-2021), SWD ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains performed at 12% (decrease of 7% from 2020-2021), SWD Math Proficiency was at 8% (increase of 1% from 2020-2021), SWD Math Learning Gains was at 32% (remained the same from 2020-2021), SWD Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains performed at 34% (decrease of 5% from 2020-2021).</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | <p>By mid-year of the 2022-2023 school year, 10% of SWD will be proficient in ELA. At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 20% of SWD will be proficient in ELA. By mid-year of the 2022-2023 school year, 10% of SWD will be proficient in Math. At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 20% of SWD will be proficient in Math. By December of 2023, Teachers will be implementing interventions with fidelity and integrity, 80% of the time. The By March 2023, the number of Tier 2 and Tier 3 coaching supports will decrease by 75%.</p> |
| Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | <p>This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity by using gradebook, walkthrough data, and district assessment data. At least once per month PLCs will engage in data analysis of the SWD ESSA subgroup to determine the effect of intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Kimberly Matthews (kdmattthe@volusia.k12.fl.us)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | <p>The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports. We will implement Achieve 3000/REWARDS which is program that provides differentiated instructional content that targets individual students' area of need. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during small group rotations and through monitoring of intervention data points. We will utilize resources from the district's curriculum map and pacing guide to differentiate instruction and provide Tier 1 foundational instructional practices aligned to the English Language Arts and Math B.E.S.T standards.</p> |

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS is not a “wait to fail” model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie’s work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity. Source: Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005; Dexter, Hughes, & Farmer, 2008; Simmons, Coyne, Kwok, McDonagh, Harn, & Kame’enui, 2008; Hattie, 2015. Schools will be provided with essential training in MTSS and its strategies to support student learning.

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.

Provide support facilitation training for gen-ed and ESE teachers.

Person Responsible Kimberly Matthews (kdmatthe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review students in intensive classes from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Determine how to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the Decision Rules and ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

Person Responsible Shawnda Shaughnessy (sashaugh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Decision Rules guidance and ICEL Strategy; Tier 1 – 100% of students should receive Tier 1 and at least 80% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. Tier 2 – 15% of students receive targeted level of prevention; Tier 3 – 3-5% of students receive intensive level of prevention; All students receive these supports in a stacked manner, including Students with Disabilities

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

Monthly PLC to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on Unit/Chapter Assessments in ELA and Math.

- Bi-weekly checkpoints of targeted students - make adjustments to the intervention, as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL.

- Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of LQ students through walkthroughs.

Students that continue to need further supports/intervention would be identified in order to move them to Tier 3.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | <p>There is a critical need to engage all students in high levels of instruction for ESSA subgroups. Instructional Practice specifically related to standards aligned instruction for English Language Learners(ELL). Based on school report card data, our ELL Proficiency in ELA was 24%(remained the same from 2020-2021), ELL ELA Learning Gains was at 33% (increase of 2% from 2020-2021), ELL ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains performed at 20% (decrease of 3% from 2020-2021), ELL Math Proficiency was at 14% (decrease of 2% from 2020-2021), ELL Math Learning Gains was at 50% (increase of 14% from 2020-2021), ELL Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains performed at 60% (increase of 5% from 2020-2021).</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | <p>By mid-year of the 2022-2023 school year, 13% of ELL will be proficient in ELA. At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 26% of ELL will be proficient in ELA. By mid-year of the 2022-2023 school year, 10% of ELL will be proficient in Math. At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 20% of ELL will be proficient in Math. By December of 2023, teachers will be implementing interventions with fidelity and integrity, 80% of the time. By March 2023, the number of Tier 2 and Tier 3 coaching supports will decrease by 75%.</p> |
| Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | <p>This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity by using gradebook, walkthrough data, and district assessment data. At least once per month PLCs will engage in data analysis of the ELL ESSA subgroup to determine the effect of intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC. The teachers will also be afforded professional learning sessions to cover how to provide accommodations for ELL students. The Intervention teacher assigned to reading will monitor instruction provided to ELLs and ensure that they are receiving ESOL accommodations in core classes. A paraprofessional will also be assigned to classes with ELLs as an additional layer of support.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Kimberly Matthews (kdmattthe@volusia.k12.fl.us)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented | <p>The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports.</p> <p>We will implement Achieve 3000/REWARDS which is program that provides differentiated instructional content that targets individual students' area of need. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during small group rotations and through monitoring of intervention data points. We will utilize resources from the district's curriculum map and pacing guide to differentiate instruction and provide Tier 1 foundational instructional practices aligned to the English Language Arts and Math B.E.S.T standards. ELL students will also be provided after school tutoring by the ESOL teacher.</p> |

**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.**

MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS is not a “wait to fail” model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie’s work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity. Source: Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005; Dexter, Hughes, & Farmer, 2008; Simmons, Coyne, Kwok, McDonagh, Harn, & Kame’enui, 2008; Hattie, 2015. Schools will be provided with essential training in MTSS and its strategies to support student learning.

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.

Provide professional development for all teachers with providing accommodations for ELL students.

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

Review ELL students from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Determine how to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the Decision Rules and ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

**Person
Responsible** Shawnda Shaughnessy (sashaugh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide tutoring for ELL students after school

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

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Interventions and Support(PBIS)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Campbell Middle School had many referrals(2585) in the 2021-2022 school year, we believe that with common expectations, common language across campus, common consequences and rewards we will be able to reduce the number of referrals.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Campbell Middle School will reduce the number of referrals by 40% for the school year 2022-23. Through monthly PBIS meetings we will be able to track data and use our PBIS resources to help change the culture, climate and drastically reduce the behavior issues on campus and in classrooms which will allow for high quality instruction. By December 2023, 90% of teachers will be implementing PBIS strategies. By April 2023, coaching support of behavior management will decrease by 80%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through data chats based on referrals, PASS, suspension, and academic achievement. The outcome will be monitored by PBIS Team and administration discipline data analyzing and observations through walk throughs including feedback to all stakeholders. We will plan PBIS three-tiered framework with common expectations, common language across campus and common consequences and rewards. We will monitor teacher and student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned PBIS. We will Use student data and district resources to help change the culture and climate and drastically reduce the behavior issues on campus and in classrooms allowing for high quality instruction to take place.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through district-wide MTSS framework. PBIS will focus this year on establishing procedures for wanted behaviors (respect, cooperation, responsibility, and safety) and providing staff with classroom management and behavior support training. PBIS training to include building relationships between teachers and students, data reviews(discipline). Middle school teaming will also be implemented to support with building positive relationships.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support is Classroom Management has an effect size of .52. Expectations and clarity of behavior expectations is fundamental to implementing PBIS. Teacher Clarity (.75 Effect Size) and PBIS are both based on the fundamentals of transparent expectations. Feedback also has an effect size of .75. PBIS is a behavior intervention system that works best with immediate rewards for positive behavior.

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this strategy.**

Teachers rewarding behavior is feedback.

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.

Review implementation data and outcome data to identify goals for 2022-23 SY

Person

Responsible

Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PBIS Professional Learning for all staff members – Teach/Review Expectations & Rules
Professional Learning through ERPLs on PBIS systems and structures.

Person

Responsible

Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teach/Review with Students Expectations & Rules

Teach/Review with families Expectations/Rules

Person

Responsible

Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Support Teachers in implementing PBIS classroom practices

Person

Responsible

Shawnda Shaughnessy (sashaugh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person

Responsible

Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data

Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

Share data with ALL stakeholders.

Person

Responsible

Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly PBIS Team Meeting

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

Determine incentive program and discipline process roll-out for ALL stakeholders
 Develop tentative schedule for yearly rewards events
 Implementing a school-wide reward system.

Person Responsible Christopher Rushing (cjrushing@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.

We are focused on using Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). We will teach/review common expectations and rules with all stakeholders (Campbell Code). Students will also be educated on campus procedures for safety and security. We are implementing a teaming model in all grade levels. Each team will create common expectations, policies and procedures. We will develop student and teacher reward systems (school rewards, team rewards, and individual teacher rewards). We are developing a student mentoring program in which every student will have a mentor teacher. Through our AVID program, students are exposed to college and career opportunities and learn to apply AVID WICOR: Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading strategies. Through an active School Advisory Committee that meets monthly, decisions are made regarding school vision, improvement goals, community involvement and the spending of funds to support school needs. Our SAC includes teachers, students, parents, school support staff, our town mayor, and a school board member.

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

Stakeholders include our teachers, school counselors, academic coaches, SEL TOA, Amin TOA, Administration and SAC committee which all play an active role in promoting a positive culture. The school leadership team meets regularly to review school needs and develops a plan for addressing those needs. The leadership team meets to discuss ways to promote a positive school culture via collaboration and social events (luncheons, fun Friday photos, etc). Additionally, our SAC committee meets monthly to review school needs and allocate funds to support school improvement.