

Volusia County Schools

David C. Hinson Sr. 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: William Dunnigan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/hinsonmiddle/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	No	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

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.

David C. Hinson Middle School will ignite a passion for learning in all students to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

David C. Hinson Middle School will create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global society.

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
Robinson, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Oversees ESE student population; supports teachers and staff to meet ESE student needs; transportation
Dunnigan, William	Principal	Oversees entire staff; supports teachers and staff members as they work to meet student needs
Fulcher, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Oversees 6th grade discipline and school-wide curriculum
Case, William K	Assistant Principal	Oversees 8th grade discipline; campus safety and facilities
Lachman-Wing, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair; SIP Chair
Flowers, Shelby	Dean	Oversees 7th grade discipline in particular, assists with other grade levels; supports Math teachers as needed
Ragano, Jamie	Instructional Coach	Support new teachers and staff; works closely with ELA

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, William Dunnigan

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.*

1

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

960

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

8

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

31

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	319	320	275	0	0	0	0	914
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	76	70	0	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	68	34	0	0	0	0	157
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	27	11	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	105	85	0	0	0	0	285
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	96	73	0	0	0	0	291
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	56	46	0	0	0	0	170

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/1/2022

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	349	342	293	0	0	0	0	984
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	48	0	0	0	0	159
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	18	35	14	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	20	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	88	69	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	111	78	0	0	0	0	275
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	42	53	34	0	0	0	0	129

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	8	16	8	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	16

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	349	342	293	0	0	0	0	984
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	48	0	0	0	0	159
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	18	35	14	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	20	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	88	69	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	111	78	0	0	0	0	275
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	42	53	34	0	0	0	0	129

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	8	16	8	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	16

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	48%	45%	50%				52%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						52%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						47%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	49%	31%	36%				63%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%						54%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						47%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	46%	53%				63%	58%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	49%	58%				80%	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	53%	50%	3%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	57%	48%	9%	55%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	61%	47%	14%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	29%	10%	46%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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	62%	57%	5%	48%	14%
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	77%	68%	9%	71%	6%
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	91%	55%	36%	57%	34%

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	16	22	18	18	36	36	24	33			
ELL	40	45	27	33	38	38	21				
ASN	79	73		75	73		69	87	79		
BLK	25	33	26	28	42	44	35	52	67		
HSP	40	36	19	34	45	48	28	75	55		
MUL	44	56		53	47		69	73	73		
WHT	54	44	27	55	52	47	64	80	76		
FRL	40	42	29	40	47	47	45	66	68		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	28	16	22	40	29	23	32			
ELL	28	48	70	33	50	33		47			

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
ASN	77	66		81	63		89	93	87		
BLK	32	30	15	33	40	35	47	63	68		
HSP	26	38	36	35	41	33	33	33			
MUL	61	56		56	50	18	56		59		
WHT	55	49	26	59	41	26	57	76	76		
FRL	40	39	23	44	40	29	43	64	63		
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	19	42	43	31	46	40	22	50			
ELL	42	65	54	63	61		33				
ASN	78	65		89	66		89	76	83		
BLK	35	46	47	44	50	42	41	70	65		
HSP	39	49	57	44	52	40	36	83			
MUL	45	50	53	60	57	65	57	75	90		
WHT	57	53	47	69	54	49	72	83	77		
FRL	39	48	47	53	51	45	51	75	64		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
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	42
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	59
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	55
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	47
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?

Our lowest quartile students improved in both ELA and Math on FSA. Students in the other quartiles did not make learning gains, with our on and above-grade-level students declining in these areas.

Our SWD across grade levels will need to have more specific attention in both ELA and Math as we help them overcome their learning obstacles, in order to meet with success.

DIAs show that students across the board did not make desired learning gains in Math or Science in most subgroups.

Our Civics cohort improved compared to their predecessors.

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

SMTs which are cumulative are more aligned with the FSA
 DIAAs which are administered more frequently and assess fewer benchmarks
 FSA and EOCs which are our state assessments

Our area of greatest concern is ELA, with our target achievement of 53% (currently at 48%).
 Our next area of concern is Math, where we hope to grow from 49% to 54%.

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

Inconsistency in common planning, PLCing, and data analysis.

Implementing MTSS, Teaming, and PBIS will help teachers and staff identify student needs and address them more effectively. Our academic coach is also attending PLC meetings to support the new teachers and the departments as a whole.

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

+3 gain in ELA lower quartile (24% --> 27%)
 +7 gain in Math 43% --> 50%
 +18 gain in Math lowest quartile (29% --> 47%)
 +2 gain Algebra (80% --> 82%)
 +2 gain Civics - 71 --> 74% pass rate

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

Certified teachers, PLCs who shared best teaching practices, teacher collaboration

Appropriate student placements

Continuum of ESE services

Focus on remediation, increase use in technology, personalized plans for ESE, data chats within each

Use of remediation period, ESE case managers monitoring students

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

Remediation of lowest benchmark standards

Differentiated Instruction

Data-driven instruction

Academic Coach

Common Planning

AVID

Teaming concept

Tutoring

PBIS

MTSS

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.

- All ERPLs will be focused on Teaming best practices targeting curriculum

- PLCs will focus on new standards and standards five standards in each subject area

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

- District Curriculum Specialist and Resource Teachers
- VE Mild Program Specialist
- Academic Coach
- Learning Walks
- Walk-throughs
- * Weekly Team Meetings
- * SLT meetings
- * Progress Monitoring tests
- * PBIS Support
- * MTSS Support

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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>Lower Quartile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FSA (27%) - SWD, 6th grade - DIA <p>Overall, our school targeted this area due to a decline over the past two years - 52% to 48%.</p>
--	--

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve the performance of our lowest quartile students in ELA.

We will use the new Progress Monitoring tool to be distributed by the State of Florida and tools provided by the district (DIAs, etc.)

Monitoring:

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

Admin and PLCs will monitor test scores to look for patterns and areas of concern.

By looking at previous year's data. During the current school year - progress monitoring tool/assessments, district assessments, formative and summative assessments, team meetings, and PLCs. The FAST data will be available for teachers to discuss during Team meetings, PLCs, SLTs and Data Chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Implementation of Collective Efficacy to promote strong collaborative practices to allow for more frequent teacher reflection and analysis of student data. Collective Efficacy has an effect size of 0.57 (Hattie, 2009). Teacher Reflection has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009).

We know students have learning gaps to be addressed. Through a variety of strategies that can include assistance from the Academic Coach, we will meet students where they are at and help them grow.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Ideas will be generated in PLCs.

The five lowest standards will be identified for targeted students. These standards will be discussed in Teams, PLCs, and SLTs to drive differentiated instruction and interdisciplinary lessons to support student performance in those standards.

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.

PLC to identify lowest standards performances

Generate ideas to address issues

Try the ideas

Report back to PLC

Reach out to Academic Coach as needed

Person Responsible William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus
Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

While we saw improvements, there is still a need for students to achieve at a higher level of proficiency based on only 47% of students meeting that criteria.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve the performance of our lowest quartile students in Math. Our goal is for student performance to increase from 49% to 54%.

We will use the new Progress Monitoring tool to be distributed by the State of Florida and tools provided by the district (DIAs, etc.)

Monitoring:

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

Admin and PLCs will monitor test scores to look for patterns and areas of concern.

By looking at previous year's data. During the current school year - progress monitoring tool/assessments, district assessments, formative and summative assessments, team meetings, and PLCs. The FAST data will be available for teachers to discuss during Team meetings, PLCs, SLTs and Data Chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Team meetings will include discussion and analysis of lowest quartile data. Implementation of Collective Efficacy to promote strong collaborative practices to allow for more frequent teacher reflection and analysis of student data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers are the ones working with the students most often, Through the meetings, they will be able to identify the strengths and target the weaknesses of the students by planning together and feedback from each other. Teachers need to reflect on their teaching strategies, progress monitoring data, and how receptive students are to the lessons being presented.

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.

Identify students and standards that present a concern

Discuss interventions

Attempt interventions for a reasonable time

Report back to the team

Stocktake

Teaming training

Department trainings during planning times

Person Responsible William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Team planning and PLC planning

Person Responsible Katherine Fulcher (ksfulche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District ERPLs - MTSS

Person Responsible Katherine Fulcher (ksfulche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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 district and informal feedback from our staff indicated a need to build positive relationships as so many were - and some still are - living in survival mode. Looking at the negative behavior trends and academic data supported goal of intentionally building positive relationships.

The number of discipline referrals will decrease by cohort as we implement PBIS school-wide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Last year, 55 students in 6th grade had one or more suspensions; 68 in 7th grade; 34 in 8th grade.

This year, we will have fewer than 55 7th graders have one or more suspensions, and fewer than 68 8th graders have one or more suspensions. Our goal for 6th grade is to have fewer suspensions than last year's cohort.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will analyze data from referrals to make sure our PBIS measures are working.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our PBIS team is teaching the staff how to use the PBIS app to reinforce positive behaviors. Additionally, members of the PBIS team are available to help teachers brainstorm if they have a challenge and need support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers have several new initiatives to implement this year. Having the app and time to practice using it will help teachers support the PBIS initiative by making it easier to monitor and maintain records.

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.

PBIS team trained (June 2022)

Train teachers (August 2022 Preplanning)

Roll out PBIS app (Second quarter)

Host events to reward students and honor students in other ways.

PBIS team meets to plan events and brainstorm rewards for students. Team leaders are working to support PBIS through their meetings with teams and in other forms of communication with each other.

Person Responsible

Shelby Flowers (slflowe1@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.

PBIS - setting positive expectations for students and creating a framework to reward positive behaviors

Teaming - creating a structure to make sure all students are seen and their needs are met; provide support for teachers

Recognizing staff and student successes

Student and staff surveys to make sure what we are doing is working/changing course as needed

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

Teachers - all teachers will participate in PBIS to promote the positive culture

Staff - all staff will participate in PBIS to promote the positive culture

Administration - all administrators will participate in PBIS to promote the positive culture

Students - attempt to adhere to the positive behaviors because adults on campus and our teaming concept has provided opportunities for student buy-in

Parents - have a better understanding of what is being asked of their child/ren, and hopefully support the efforts of the school because we will have a streamlined set of expectations based on Teaming and PBIS efforts

The community at large - have a better understanding of what is being asked of the students and adults on campus, and hopefully support the efforts of the school because we will have a streamlined set of expectations based on Teaming and PBIS efforts that will be publicized