# Southwestern Middle School

# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Southwestern Middle School

## 605 W NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, Deland, FL 32720

## http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/southwesternmiddle/pages/default.aspx

### Demographics

## Principal: Jacqu ESE Copeland J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2016

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) |
| **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.](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

# Southwestern Middle School

## 605 W NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, Deland, FL 32720

## http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/southwesternmiddle/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 | 55% |

## 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.**

Southwestern Middle School guides students to develop a strong social and academic foundation for their future success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Southwestern Middle School is a collaborative, data-driven learning community where all instructional staff are facilitators of student-led learning.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Copeland, Jacquese | Principal | |
| Azucar, Holly | Instructional Media | |
| DiGrazia, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | |
| Hooker, Pamela | Teacher, ESE | |
| Klimas, Keith | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Pena, Heidi | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Perrino, Nicole | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Johnson, Kung | Dean | |
| Pieri, Suzanne | Instructional Coach | |
| Ruppen, Jessica | Assistant Principal | |
| Bryant, Bernadette | Instructional Coach | |
| | | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 8/1/2016, Jacqu ESE Copeland 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.*
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.*
49

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

53

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

719

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

5

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

5

**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 | 227 | 220 | 259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 706 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 73 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 69 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |
| Course failure in ELA | 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 | | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 72 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 231 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 65 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |

**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 | 59 | 68 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

**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 | 241 | 221 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 723 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 63 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 41 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 55 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 62 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 79 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 |

**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 | 58 | 56 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |

**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 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**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 | 241 | 221 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 723 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 63 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 41 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 55 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 62 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 79 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 |

**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 | 58 | 56 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |

**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 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

## 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 | 45% | 45% | 50% | | | | 49% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 45% | | | | | | 51% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | | | | | | 40% | 42% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 45% | 31% | 36% | | | | 41% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 51% | | | | | | 43% | 51% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | | | | | | 42% | 42% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 46% | 46% | 53% | | | | 51% | 58% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 74% | 49% | 58% | | | | 68% | 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 | 49% | 50% | -1% | 54% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 47% | -7% | 52% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 50% | -2% | 56% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 55% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 47% | -16% | 54% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 14% | 29% | -15% | 46% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |

| 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 | 49% | 57% | -8% | 48% | 1% |
| 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 | 66% | 68% | -2% | 71% | -5% |

| 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 | 65% | 54% | 11% | 61% | 4% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 55% | 45% | 57% | 43% |

## 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 | 17 | 36 | 31 | 20 | 36 | 41 | 21 | 43 | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 42 | 33 | 25 | 40 | 44 | 23 | 71 | 50 | | |
| ASN | 76 | 71 | | 56 | 79 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 42 | 35 | 28 | 45 | 45 | 31 | 59 | 59 | | |
| HSP | 37 | 44 | 29 | 36 | 49 | 51 | 38 | 74 | 54 | | |
| MUL | 45 | 41 | | 43 | 57 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 46 | 33 | 59 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 80 | 57 | | |
| FRL | 39 | 43 | 32 | 39 | 50 | 52 | 40 | 68 | 52 | | |
| **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 | 15 | 32 | 27 | 16 | 38 | 37 | 18 | 28 | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 39 | 43 | 25 | 36 | 33 | 15 | 53 | | | |

| 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 | 57 | 77 | | 50 | 54 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 37 | 28 | 21 | 28 | 38 | 30 | 54 | 47 | | |
| HSP | 38 | 41 | 35 | 32 | 35 | 34 | 35 | 57 | 59 | | |
| MUL | 52 | 74 | | 36 | 45 | | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 53 | 38 | 51 | 36 | 44 | 63 | 76 | 67 | | |
| FRL | 38 | 44 | 37 | 31 | 35 | 39 | 38 | 59 | 49 | | |
| 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 | 17 | 35 | 34 | 19 | 38 | 35 | 20 | 34 | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 35 | 30 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 18 | 30 | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 64 | | 80 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 43 | 33 | 26 | 30 | 29 | 22 | 53 | 75 | | |
| HSP | 41 | 44 | 33 | 32 | 44 | 57 | 36 | 55 | 52 | | |
| MUL | 55 | 52 | | 67 | 55 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 58 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 40 | 66 | 80 | 73 | | |
| FRL | 40 | 47 | 39 | 34 | 42 | 41 | 41 | 60 | 72 | | |

## 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 | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 506 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| 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 | 41 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 47 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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?**

Social studies increased, math lowest quartile and learning gains increased. Targeted subgroups increased from 2021 to 2022 for African American and ELL students. Six grade ela increased. Science scores decreased over the last 4 years.

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

Based off PM and state assessments the areas that need the most attention are our SWD, specifically with achievement in ela and math. School proficiency rates among SWD is critically low with a top class having 14% proficiency on any one district assessment.

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

Contributing factors are inconsistent certified instructors. Sacrificing accountability to provide grace during COVID. Lack of building relationships over the past few years due to online learning and COVID.

In addition the school had 229 students with 10%+ days absent. There is a strong correlation among the students receiving level 1 in reading and math also had high attendance issues.

There will be a PD on UDL and how to track and use strategies to target students struggling. Southwestern admin team will put a high emphasis on monitoring that UDL strategies are thoughtfully integrated throughout lessons by conducting daily walkthroughs.

Increasing consistency through PBIS and SEL.

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

Math achievement, gains and lowest quartile increased in all 3 subcategories. Social Studies also had an increase from 65% proficient in 2021 to 74% in 2022.

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

Quality core instruction with great classroom management and teachers exemplifying high expectations. Consistent certified instructions, strong plc's, extra planning time, and small group instruction.

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

Coaching, teacher clarity on school's mission, vision and SIP plan with a high focus on plc's with teacher retention.

**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.**

UDL facilitated by district specialist, on-going plc with coaching support in math, reading and science. Individualized PD during plc's.

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

Maintain a collaborative, positive, fun culture that supports teachers in growing. Provide coaching corner for all teachers.

**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:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | SWD was the lowest subgroup at 28%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | To increase proficiency among SWD by 10 percent.<br>85% of classroom teachers will implement the use of UDL strategies into their classroom instruction.<br>Coaches will complete coaching cycles related to UDL strategies on a least 50% of classroom teachers. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Administrative Walkthroughs will be used to monitor the percentage of teachers implementing UDL strategies.<br>Professional Learning Community minutes will be used to monitor teachers planning for the use of UDL strategies. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | School will provide district PD on UDL strategies. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | The rational is for teachers to analyze trends based from classroom data and observations, to be able to select strategies to help students in learning and increase student achievement. |

**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.

UDL Faculty Training - September 19, 2022
Walkthrough look for development by the school leadership team - September 26, 2022
Walkthrough Schedule Implementation
Follow up with teachers through coaching cycles
Monitor student and teacher data to gage goal progress

| **Person Responsible** | Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

| #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | After taking a deeper look into the school discipline report, there was a high disparity among referrals written for Black students in comparison to White. Currently 71% of Black students received 1 or more referrals in comparison to 26% White students who received 1 or more students. It is important to note that Black students represent 25% of the total student population and White students represent 46% of the total student population |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Decrease the referrals for Black students from 53% to 23% by June 2023. Teachers will implement 2 SEL circles per week and 1 SEL class challenge per week. |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monthly Discipline Report |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kung Johnson (jckung@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | The evidence-based strategies that will be implemented are restorative circles. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | According to the NEPC brief, research shows that restorative programs have helped reduce exclusionary discipline and narrow the glaring racial disparities in how discipline is meted out in schools. |

**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.

Pre-planning - Faculty and staff training on restorative practices, SEL and circles
SEL Tips of the Week shared by the SEL TOA
Monitoring of circle implementation by the admin team through daily walkthroughs
Monitor monthly discipline data by the PBIS team and share data with teachers at faculty meetings

**Person Responsible**     Kung Johnson (jckung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Based off the FSA 2022 data we found that we need to increase ELA and MATH achievement. Both ELA and MATH are at 45% for the 2022 school year. Which is less than 50% of our students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Increase ELA and MATH by 10%, making proficiency 55% in 2023. Teachers will implement effective feedback practice in the clasroom. Coaches will complete at least 2 coaching cycles with all identified teachers. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | State Baseline and District Assessments |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Suzanne Pieri (smpieri@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Specific and timely teacher feedback |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | The research from John Hattie shows the importance of feedback that increases student achievement with an effect size of . 73, Feedback is almost double that of the hinge point . 4, making it an effective instructional strategy that is applicable across disciplines and grades. |

**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.

Feedback training for teachers for through PLC meetings.
Identify coaching rosters.
Monitor teacher feedback practices through classroom and gradebook walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible**          Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@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.**

Monthly teacher appreciations
Recognizing students monthly
Students recognizing students
PBIS - Team Banners
Increasing Teacher and Student Voice
Welcoming Environment
Mix and Mingles for Teachers
Building Relationships
SSYRA Spotlights
Book Fairs
Team Activities

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

PTSO Involvement
PBIS Team
SLT
Admin Team
Teachers
Holiday Inn
Families