

Volusia County Schools

Silver Sands 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

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

Demographics

Principal: Rick Inge

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2022

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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: B (55%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%)
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

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Inge, Rick	Principal	Oversee SIP process. Conduit between school and community. Lead data analysis conversations.
Hanrahan, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Assist in data analysis. Participate in writing of SIP and monitoring SAC meeting compliance. Facilitating StockTake discussions for mathematics.
Leathead, Todd	Assistant Principal	Administrator lead for ELA department. Facilitating StockTake discussion for ELA.
Mitchell, LaTonya	Assistant Principal	ESE Administrator monitoring the progress of students with disabilities
Carlisle, Travis	Math Coach	Works with math department for standards aligned instruction, data analysis, etc.
Circelli, Cindy	Reading Coach	Works with ELA department for standards aligned instruction, data analysis, etc.
Boss, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair for ELA department

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/11/2022, Rick Inge

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,200

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

22

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

24

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	382	377	435	0	0	0	0	1194
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	109	134	0	0	0	0	344
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	104	112	0	0	0	0	306
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	31	32	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	14	47	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	115	158	0	0	0	0	368
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	123	136	0	0	0	0	375
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	66	93	0	0	0	0	226

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	108	118	149	0	0	0	0	375

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	12	11	11	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	62	83	0	0	0	0	210

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	17	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	14

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	62	83	0	0	0	0	210

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	17	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	14

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	52%	45%	50%				58%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						56%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						47%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	55%	31%	36%				66%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%						57%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						52%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	46%	53%				65%	58%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	49%	58%				81%	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	56%	50%	6%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	63%	47%	16%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	29%	16%	46%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	63%	57%	6%	48%	15%
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	79%	68%	11%	71%	8%
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	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%
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	31	33	23	37	29	27	46	40		
ELL	32	39	48	37	48	39	22	50			
ASN	70	53		86	82		73	71	95		
BLK	28	38	36	31	46	42	40	48	73		
HSP	46	40	35	45	43	29	52	58	94		
MUL	60	37	40	54	50		71	82	63		
WHT	58	45	36	61	54	43	65	86	77		
FRL	45	42	36	47	50	38	54	70	74		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	27	18	19	31	32	27	43	17		
ELL	35	46	32	28	24	18		45	73		

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	74	70		66	48			77	86		
BLK	31	37	22	22	25	18	35	48	64		
HSP	46	45	24	39	38	25	50	56	75		
MUL	54	59		50	38		53	75	83		
WHT	58	49	31	56	47	38	67	72	80		
FRL	46	42	24	42	38	30	56	58	72		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	40	38	30	42	36	30	51	29		
ELL	27	50	47	47	59	63	20	80			
ASN	71	65		88	63			100	100		
BLK	37	48	51	46	50	43	33	67	89		
HSP	53	56	50	59	66	65	59	68	79		
MUL	52	54	38	55	49	50	69	77	82		
WHT	62	57	48	70	58	54	70	84	80		
FRL	50	51	40	60	54	51	58	74	76		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	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	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	49
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	57
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	58
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	49
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?

ESSA Subgroup SWD in all grade levels continue to be below 41% since 2019
 Math State assessment data continued to show an increase in Level 3 and above, LG and LQ LG
 FSA ELA scores continued to show a downward trend except for LQ LG that increased 8 points

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

State Assessments:

LQ ELA 36% (-11% compared to 2019)

LQ Math 41% (-11% compared to 2019)

ESSA subgroup SWD continue to show a downward trend. (2018: 44%, 2019: 35%, 2020: N/A, 2021: 26%, 2022: 30%)

2021-22 District Assessments All Subject Areas:

6th grade SWD: 21%

7th grade SWD: 18%

8th grade SWD: 19%

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

Inexperienced ESE teachers, many without subject area certification. We will continue to expose them to on grade level instruction, best practices, data analysis of district/state assessments, etc., in an effort to increase their effectiveness. Some have attempted to pass subject area exams but have failed. Study groups are being set up to assist them with studying for the subject area exams.

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

Math LQ LG (+10)

Civics (+10)

MATH LG (+9)

ELA LQ (+8)

Math Level 3+ (+5)

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

Coaching support in planning and understanding of benchmark aligned instruction.
District Curriculum Specialist worked with our subject area departments on a regular basis
Walk-throughs used to collect data regarding progress.

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

ELA and Math instructional coaching
Utilize new curriculum and resources available to teachers
Full understanding of new state FAST testing for math and ELA
MS Teaming with a high focus on individual student data

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.

Student engagement teaming activities
PBIS/MTSS
TEAMING
Standards-based

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

District support for all core areas
Data Room for a focus on highest areas of need and lowest performing standards
Data analysis of new district and state assessments

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.

We have identified this as a critical need due to evidence collected in the 2021-2022 school year.
 This data was collected through the process of learning walks, both school based and district, walk throughs by administration, coaches, TOAs, department heads and district specialists. During these walk throughs it was observed that the standard being taught did not align to the academic language and activities in the learning environment.
 Through the process of data analysis during PLC's and intervention meetings we determined that the school was not meeting the expectation for learning gains. It was determined that learning targets were not being met in all core subjects, specifically for ELA.

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

Our overall goal is to have all teachers practicing standards - aligned instruction by January 30th at a rate of 100%.
 By October, 60% of teachers will show evidence of their instructional practices to be standards- aligned utilizing small group instruction to differentiate instruction.
 By November, this will increase to 80%.
 By December, this will be all 100% of teachers.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through learning walks led by administration, academic coaches, district specialists, and department heads with an increase of positive data collected moving from 60% in Sept. 2022 to 100% by March 2023. Feedback will be given to all teachers during small group PLC time on a weekly basis.
 The Area of Focus will be monitored by data chats within PLCs with a desired increase on growth measure assessments throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rick Inge (rringe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

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

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

Through the process of data analysis during PLC's and intervention meetings we determined that the school was not meeting the expectation for learning gains. It was determined that learning targets were not being met in all core subjects, specifically for ELA.
 This data was collected through the process of learning walks, both school based and district, walk throughs by administration, coaches, TOAs, department heads and district specialists. During these walk throughs it was observed that the standard being taught did not align to the academic language and activities in the learning environment.

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.

The action steps that will be taken to address this area of focus include learning walks which are to be led by administration, academic coaches, district specialists and department heads. Administration and academic coaches will monitor the posting of standards in each class.
 Teachers will be trained on standards- aligned instruction through ERPLs and PLCs and the importance of

not only posting standards, learning targets and success criteria but also the importance that the standard being taught aligns to the academic language and activities in the learning environment. We will implement this by having teachers lead with unpacking the targeted areas of the standard, referencing the standard, then determining if the success criteria has been met.

Person Responsible Kelly Hanrahan (klhanrah@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

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

During the 2021-22 school year, approximately 315 of our students had below 90% attendance rate. We also had an increase in student disruptive, disrespectful, and sometimes violent behavior that interrupted the learning environment. These behavior issues led to loss of instructional time. This loss of instructional time led to not reaching the set goal on grade level state wide assessments.

Due to the unprecedented times, teachers and staff have a greater need to cultivate a positive environment that leads teachers to work in a collaborative manner with one another. This will ensure the safety and security of all students on campus. While also providing a positive climate for learning.

For the 2022-2023 school year our staff consists of 27 new to Silver Sands with 8 being new to the profession.

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

During the 2021-22 school year 315 students were below 90% attendance. This will be measured through TEAMS discussing attendance, initiating their own attendance incentives and PSTs will be initiated as needed.

Decrease in disruptive student behaviors by utilizing positive referrals and the PBIS implementation.

Increase in student achievement will be measured by progress monitoring, district assessment and teacher data such as communication logs.

School counselors assess quarter grades to ensure promotion to next grade level as well as appropriately meeting grade level goals on state wide assessments.

During the 2021-22 school year 315 students were below 90% attendance. This will be monitored through TEAMS discussing attendance, initiating their own attendance incentives. Attendance will also be monitored and the appropriate steps will be taken after students have missed 15 days.

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

School counselors will assess PSTs to determine if referrals to school social worker need to be made. School counselors will monitor quarter grades to ensure promotion to next grade level as well as appropriately meeting grade level goals on state wide assessments.

A specific SEL TOA position will concentrate on the implementation and use of PBIS strategies throughout our school campus. This will involve all employees and students.

We will also monitor all of the Early Warning Systems components to see if there are any glaring areas of concern that need attention.

Disciple TOAs will assist in monitoring student trends in referrals and positive effects from PBIS.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Kelly Hanrahan (klhanrah@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:
Describe the evidence-**

Implementation of PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support)
Teacher Teaming
PSTs

based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Data chats with academic coaches, administrators, and district specialists.
 Progress monitoring (FAST)
 Early Warning Systems in focus
 Discipline referrals in focus
 Student attendance
 Teacher attendance

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

During the 2021-22 school year, approximately 315 of our students had below 90% attendance rate. We also had an increase in student disruptive, disrespectful, and sometimes violent behavior that interrupted the learning environment. Due to these disruptions, the set goal for grade level wide assessments was not met. This was determined through test scores, PLCs and walk throughs.
 If the school utilizes a researched based program (PBIS) that has proven to increase student achievement and focus on social emotional needs, then an increase in academic performance will be measurable as well as a decrease in student off-task disruptive behaviors.

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 training for all staff in August 2022.
 Development of School PBIS Team in July 2022.
 Training for teachers in Teaming provided in August 2022 with follow-up training throughout the year as provided by the district.
 MTSS training for all teachers in August 2022.

Person Responsible Kelly Hanrahan (klhanrah@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

n/a

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

n/a

Measurable Outcomes:

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Monitoring:

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

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

n/a

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

n/a

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.

Implement use of PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Program)
 Incentivize student performance and behavior
 Student and Staff interactions
 Community and Family involvement
 Dances
 Assemblies
 Incentives by department
 Award Assemblies/recognition opportunities

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

Classroom teachers - developing and monitoring risk free learning environments
Students - actively and respectfully engages and taking ownership for own learning
Admin - classroom visits and providing school-wide activities that promote staff/student interaction
Support Staff - creating and welcoming learning environment
Parents - support students and school, volunteering, positive advocates for school
Elective Teachers - promoting student involvement in community activities
SLT/SAC - help support and promote a positive school culture