

Volusia County Schools

# Riverview Learning Center



## 2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                     | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                      | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                        | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>                | <b>12</b> |
| <b>R.A.I.S.E</b>                               | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>      | <b>21</b> |

## Riverview Learning Center

801 N WILD OLIVE AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/alternative-education/pages/riverview-and-highbanks-learning-centers.asp>

### Demographics

**Principal: Thomas Soli J**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/4/2020

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>2021-22 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active                      |
| <b>School Function</b><br>(per accountability file)  |                             |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-12 |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education       |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes                         |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%                        |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |                             |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |                             |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>   | 2023-24: No Rating          |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Our mission is to promote graduation assurance through an alternative educational program, by providing academic and social emotional instruction through a safe and positive learning environment during a break in the traditional school setting.

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

Our vision is to ensure that every stakeholder is committed to building positive relationships and changing lives for the better.

**Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

Riverview Learning Center provides a short-term Alternative Education Program for approximately 200 students (grades K-12) who live on the east side of Volusia County. These programs are designed to address behavioral problems of middle and high school students. The students in these programs are temporarily removed from their zoned school because of disruptive behavior and/or have committed an offense which may warrant expulsion from the school district. Recommendation for placement is made by the District Student Placement Committee, the IEP committee, or the Assistant Superintendent. The therapeutic component provides a personalized mental health treatment plan that carefully monitors the counseling needs of individual students. Counseling may be provided in a group or individual setting and will address specific behavioral skills that need to be mastered by the student. The student is an active participant in the development of personal behavioral goals as part of this plan

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Soli, Thomas     | Principal           | <p>Provides a common vision for the use of data- based decision-making by promoting the Volusia Strategic Plan. Ensures that educators are implementing the district's Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) accessible through the K-12 curriculum link of the webpage and the VCS Problem MTSS model, for those students who do not respond effectively to core instruction. Ensure adequate professional development is scheduled for faculty. Teachers meet weekly to discuss concerns of individual students during PLC/MTSS meetings led by teacher on assignment. Interventions are brainstormed and then tracked and reported after several weeks of implementation by the teachers. Teacher support systems include the reading coach, administrators, mentors, behavior specialist, social worker, and school psychologist.</p> |
| Jenkins, Steafon | Assistant Principal | <p>Act as assistant to school principal of Riverview Learning Center. Carry out the general policies and regulations of the District of Volusia County, under direction of Mr. Soli. May perform any of the principal's duties as assigned by the principal including but not limited to discipline, testing, exceptional student education, facilities, and safety and security.</p>  |
| Garbutt, Ann     | School Counselor    | <p>Responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the mental health, social emotional learning and all other school counselor duties by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.</p>   |
| Boyle, Brent     | Teacher, ESE        | <p>Responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the ESE department by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.</p>   |
| Cotto, Maggie    | Teacher, K-12       | <p>Responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into and relevant information back to the curriculum department/ teachers of Riverview Learning Center by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.</p>   |

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

no

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 2/4/2020, Thomas Soli J

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

23

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

19

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

17

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

2

**Number of teachers with ESE certification?**

9

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

1

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

5

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2022-23**

**The number of students by 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           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3  | 1  | 0     | 23 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 0     | 14 |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3  | 0  | 0     | 22 |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 1  | 0     | 6  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0     | 5  |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 0     | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 0     | 12 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2  | 1  | 0  | 20    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/4/2022

**2021-22 - Updated**

**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                              | 2           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 22 | 19 | 12 | 6  | 2  | 0  | 86    |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 1           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 21 | 15 | 10 | 5  | 2  | 0  | 72    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 2           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 22 | 17 | 10 | 6  | 1  | 0  | 80    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 9  | 9  | 5  | 2  | 1  | 0  | 32    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 12 | 7  | 3  | 2  | 1  | 0  | 29    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8  | 16 | 12 | 10 | 4  | 1  | 0  | 54    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 9  | 3  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7  | 22 | 10 | 5  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 17 | 12 | 6  | 1  | 0  | 69    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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             |        | 49%      | 55%   |        |          |       |        | 54%      | 61%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 53%      | 59%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 44%      | 54%   |
| Math Achievement            |        | 32%      | 42%   |        |          |       |        | 55%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 52%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 45%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         |        | 45%      | 54%   |        |          |       |        | 61%      | 56%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        | 52%      | 59%   |        |          |       |        | 72%      | 78%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 50%      | -50%                       | 54%   | -54%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 47%      | -47%                       | 52%   | -52%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 50%      | -50%                       | 56%   | -56%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| <b>MATH</b>       |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 01                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 02                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 03                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 0%            | 48%             | -48%                              | 55%          | -55%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 0%            | 47%             | -47%                              | 54%          | -54%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 0%            | 29%             | -29%                              | 46%          | -46%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>    |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 0%            | 57%             | -57%                              | 48%          | -48%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 0%     | 72%      | -72%                  | 67%   | -67%               |

  

| CIVICS EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year       | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022       |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019       | 0%     | 68%      | -68%                  | 71%   | -71%               |

  

| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 0%     | 63%      | -63%                  | 70%   | -70%               |

  

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 0%     | 54%      | -54%                  | 61%   | -61%               |

  

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 55%      | -55%                  | 57%   | -57%               |

**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 |
| 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 |
| 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 |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | N/A |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    |     |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       |     |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  |     |
| Percent Tested  |     |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

Progress monitoring reports are in place for weekly updates and discussion. We have PLC, Leadership Teams, and Instructional teams, that meet and review areas of concern and individual needs for student successes in academics, behavior and graduation assurance.

As we reflect on last year's progress monitoring, we did an excellent job at analyzing student behavior and credits, but lacked attention in helping students with Math and Reading deficiencies. As a result we began to implement the Freckle/Renaissance program in our Secondary classes. We were in the beginning stages/trial basis, so they data was analyzed in PLC to help guide instruction or to help students in Math and Reading as desired. We need to be deliberate with this program and use the tool to help students in math and reading as they go back to their home school. We will perform diagnostics and final test upon student returning to their home school to see if improvements took place.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Using the Edgenuity educational program and course completions, Course and Credit completion showed the most improvement. We implemented Professional Development for instructors and staff, reading interventions, social emotional training, PLC meetings and progress monitoring tools for tracking. Increased course completion towards remediation goal resulting in student transferring back to zone school and grade level by credit or quality points.

#### What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Math Proficiency / ELA Proficiency. Students lack foundation in Math and Reading skills, along with attendance issues, students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Students lack foundation in Math and Reading skills, along with attendance issues, students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general. Students in alternative ed. tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA and graduation rate.

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

Math/ELA proficiency best practices in the classroom, Iready and Waterford as a supplemental resource, remediation of Math, ELA and identified areas of reading skills.

Continue PLC's and monitoring meetings, develop positive teacher/student relationship, increase course completions, graduation assurance through credit retrieval, successful transition back to zoned school, increase in graduation rate.

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

There are 8 professional development sessions scheduled for teachers, to provide an opportunity to develop professional skills in ESE,EBD, MTSS, PBIS, social skills, and success criteria strategies.

Weekly PLC and data meetings to take place as well as orientation meetings with parents and students to go over academic and behavior data.

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that only 48% of our students district wide in ELA and 46% of Math district wide, below state average. Further analysis showed that most of the students in our lowest quartile are also in one or more of our 3 targeted ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, BLK.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal will be to increase the percentage of students making proficiency from 48% to 51% in ELA and 46% to 49% in Math, including our ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, and BLK. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA and Chapter Assessments in Math to monitor progress of our LQ and ESSA subgroups.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity checks of the interventions that were selected to ensure the fidelity and integrity of implementation (What percentage of our students is increasing?). Two times per month PLCs will engage in data analysis of LQ and ESSA subgroup students to determine the effect of the intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC. The instrument for data collection will be (related to area of need).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports.

K-2- Waterford  
 Grades 3-5- Iready  
 Grades 6-12

Program that provide differentiated instructional content that targets individual students' area of need. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during small group rotations and through monitoring of intervention data points. All grades will utilize resources from the district's curriculum map and pacing guide to differentiate instruction and provide Tier 1 foundational instructional practices aligned to the English Language Arts B.E.S.T standards

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

MTSS is a comprehensive, evidence-based prevention framework. Within MTSS, multiple levels of support are provided to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral development of all students. Through it, all students are given access to inclusive and equitable educational practices that minimize opportunity gaps. MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. Individual student data provides information to develop strategies and instruction to help remediate student deficiencies and accelerate the learning process. Progress monitoring will help determine any changes that need to be made in students learning plan to help students succeed.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

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

Review students in intervention from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Determine how to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

**Person Responsible**

Brent Boyle (bjboyle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Developing and Monitoring SLT and MTSS process.

**Person Responsible**

Thomas Soli (tjsoli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate monthly PLC to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress.

**Person Responsible**

Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning Development in MTSS process throughout the year.  
Professional Learning Development in learning Freckle/Renaissance program for Math and Reading.  
Professional Learning development in the area of analyzing Math and Reading Data as it relates to student improvement in Math and Reading.  
Professional Learning Development in the area of Best standards and implementation.

**Person Responsible**

Thomas Soli (tjsoli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School leadership team will monitor data and implementation and report bi-weekly. Designated SLT team members will provide instruction support and coaching to teachers as needed. If needed, teachers that are struggling will have mentor teacher to help in coaching cycle. On going collaborative planning between secondary teachers to ensure students are engaged in learning process and are tiered appropriately.

**Person Responsible**

Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

## #2. Other specifically relating to PBIS Systems and Structures

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Student behaviors, such as physical & verbal aggression, have increased in recent years as indicated by increases in incidents of physical aggression & increases in Office Discipline Referrals. Additionally, district data shows disproportionate discipline of minority students and students with disabilities.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2021-22 SY, 31.58% of VCS schools indicated an ineffective Core behavioral instruction & fidelity. An effective Core was indicated at a rate of 68.42%. Our goal will be to increase effective Core behavioral instruction to 75% during the 2022-23 SY. We will utilize PBIS Implementation Checklist data & Benchmarks of Quality data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing Discipline Referrals and suspensions of all student subgroups.

### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in the fall, spring and year's end through the implementation checklists and Benchmarks of Quality surveys. Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored both at the district level and school



level  
monthly during PBIS PLCs  
to increase core instruction  
in behavior for all  
students and intensifying  
monitoring of  
disproportionate rates of  
discipline.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Steafton Jenkins  
(sjenkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

The evidence-based  
strategy being implemented  
is a multi-disciplinary  
approach through district-  
wide MTSS framework.  
Outcomes will be measured  
& monitored:

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

- Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS planning team and by the school based PBIS PLCs on a monthly basis.

- Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the PBIS District Coordinator, Dr. Mandy Ellzey, following the close of the reporting windows for fall reporting, spring reporting and year end. This data will also be monitored by the PBIS teams to be used for progress monitoring and planning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making. Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks

of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). These assessments contains 53-items divided into ten critical elements that make up an effective PBIS Tier 1 system. Completion of the BoQ produces scale and subscale scores indicating the extent to which these critical elements are in place.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

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

Attend District PBIS training  
 Identify goals for 2022-23 school year.  
 Develop and Train all staff members on PBIS model and expectations.

**Person Responsible**

Thomas Soli  
 (tjsoli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor PBIS process and structures and data related to Behavior Intervention.(Monthly)

**Person Responsible**

Steafon Jenkins  
 (sjenkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data  
 Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist  
 Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist  
 End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

**Person Responsible**

Steafon Jenkins  
 (sjenkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Attend District PBIS training  
 Identify goals for 2022-23 school year.  
 Develop and Train all staff members on PBIS model and expectations.

**Person Responsible**

Thomas Soli  
 (tjsoli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor PBIS process and structures and data related to Behavior Intervention.(Monthly)

**Person Responsible**

Steafon Jenkins  
 (sjenkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data  
 Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist  
 Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist  
 End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

**Person Responsible**

Steafon Jenkins  
(sjenkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**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**

na

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

na

**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)**

na

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

na

**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.

na

**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?

na

**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?

na

**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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

na

**Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

**Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.**

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

**Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.**

Data would be collect through FOCUS discipline browse, Edgenuity, Daily behavior memos and updates that are sent home to parents, point sheets, Red and White Sheets, Green sheets, and PBIS Incentive tracking,

**Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.**

Through professional development initially and stakeholder communication. All teacher are able to access Focus Discipline Browser and PBIS reward system data.

**Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.**

During PLC's and Monthly ERPL

**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.

| Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring            |
|---|--|
| Identify School Needs<br>Attend Relevant training and PD<br>Develop PBIS Action Plan/Strategies<br>Train and Inform Stakeholders<br>Monitor for fidelity<br>Make adjustments and continuously review data | Jenkins, Steafon, sjenkins@volusia.k12.fl.us |