Atlantic High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Atlantic High School, personal responsibility is an essential component of our curriculum. In order to emphasize and teach personal responsibility, we believe that teachers, students, and parents must clearly understand the role each must play in helping every one of our students to achieve academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Atlantic High School, every person is treated with dignity and respect. We welcome and encourage students, families, staff and community to learn together. Our students develop their unique talents to graduate with the greatest treasure—enthusiasm for lifelong learning as responsible, creative citizens.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Watson, Jason	Principal	Oversees entire school effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps.
Doster, Julian	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Assistant Principal who leads entire school effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps. Evaluates Math department.
Gariepy, Darlene	Assistant Principal	Discipline Assistant Principal who leads entire school effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps. MTSS Point person. Evaluates Science department.
Cone, Mallory	Assistant Principal	ESE Assistant Principal who leads entire school effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps. Evaluates ESE and Reading department.
Rich, Caleb	Math Coach	Math Coach who supports instruction effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps.
Williams, Sasha	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach who supports instruction effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps. Leads professional development of teachers.
Rinaldi, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	AVID Director who supports instruction effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps. Supports professional development of teachers with a focus on AVID Strategies being implemented school wide.
McCann, Tiffany	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Director who supports instruction effort to implement and monitor goals and actions steps. Responsible for monitoring College and Career acceleration opportunities.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team is comprised of administration, academic coaches and teachers including CTE. The SAC which includes students plays an important role in the SIP including the evaluation of the SIP and area of focus midyear reflection.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be a guiding document throughout the year with areas of focus being shared with teachers and staff in monthly meetings. Input will be solicited from staff, the SLT and the SAC throughout the year as we monitor the progress. The actions steps will be monitored by the identified person responsible. Actions steps will be modified or added as needed during SIP review in stock-take meetings twice annually.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	97%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	44	50	46	46	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				47			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			36		
Math Achievement*	25	28	38	27	33	38	24		
Math Learning Gains				35			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			34		
Science Achievement*	69	68	64	65	30	40	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	59	66	66	40	48	55		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	89	90	89	92	65	61	88		
College and Career Acceleration	58	65	65	56	62	67	41		
ELP Progress	50	44	45	50			36		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	92

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	4	
ELL	24	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	40	Yes	1	
BLK	47			
HSP	50			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	42			
HSP	49			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			25			69	64		89	58	50
SWD	17			17			32	40		33	6	
ELL	17			5							3	50
AMI												
ASN				40							1	
BLK	30			19			48	53		47	6	
HSP	41			18			67	55		25	6	
MUL	46			31				50		40	5	
PAC												
WHT	48			27			76	72		66	6	
FRL	37			21			64	55		49	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	47	35	27	35	42	65	66		92	56	50
SWD	24	35	31	11	33	44	33	30		76	37	
ELL	25	52	50	7	33		58					50
AMI												
ASN	46	54										
BLK	35	48	44	16	30	28	42	40		93	39	
HSP	37	40	31	19	31		57	80		90	58	
MUL	68	54		30	37		69			100	86	
PAC												
WHT	50	46	30	34	38	61	75	75		90	60	
FRL	40	45	34	24	34	42	57	60		92	49	50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	47	36	24	27	34	65	55		88	41	36
SWD	21	33	27	16	30	32	42	47		82	27	
ELL	23	45		23	30							36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	35	26	11	29	35	46	38		89	26	
HSP	42	50		13	11		59	31		97	26	
MUL	41	45		30	33		64	50		91	30	
PAC												
WHT	58	52	44	32	27	26	76	65		85	53	
FRL	38	42	36	21	27	33	60	48		85	33	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	43%	45%	-2%	50%	-7%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	48%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	16%	32%	-16%	50%	-34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	39%	-12%	48%	-21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	65%	3%	63%	5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	63%	-1%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math proficiency increased to 29% in 2023 but remained lowest compared to all other core subjects. Our Math department lost two teachers during the year in the tested Math classes. The trend continued to grow from the previous year but did not achieve the percentage we are working towards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Social Studies did show the greatest decline from the prior year. Administration was concerned with the standards-based instruction with one of our teachers. Our 11th Grade US History teacher left the school at the end of the year. His performance was lower than anticipated. Data showed that his students performed lower than our previous US History students. This impacted our overall Social Studies proficiency performance last year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math proficiency increased to 29% in 2023 but remained the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our Math department lost two teachers during the year in the tested Math classes. This resulted in shuffling of teachers within the department to cover the loss. As a result teachers who covered the classes were not familiar with the curriculum and standard-based instruction was inconsistent. The trend continued to grow from the previous year but did not achieve the percentage we are working towards. We will work to close the gap this year with the state average by offering Algebra 1a and adding another Math teacher to run intervention for Algebra and Geometry. The new Math intervention teacher will push into classrooms for Algebra and Geometry and work with students who are close to meeting proficiency but need additional support. The teacher will also pull students into small group based on needs. Our PLC's will meet this year with specific planning focused on high quality instruction and the look-fors being implemented each lesson.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was Biology. This was the PLC's second straight year planning together. The PLC team met each week and focused on high quality lessons aligned to the benchmarks. The lessons planned included use of common formative assessments. The team included data chats each week looking at achievement specifically related to each benchmark. The team also met for a full day in the Spring to look at data, break down performance on each standard and plan any needed remediation. This PLC is the model for our work this year in refining our practices.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our EWS report identified the areas of concern for Atlantic High School included attendance and the amount of students performing at the lowest level on the ELA and Math state assessments.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Math 2. ELA 3. Attendance. 4. Subgroup SWD 5. Subgroup ELL

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Attendance indicates that 32% of our student population missed at least 10% of the school days last year. These students are identified as chronically absent.

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

Atlantic High School will decrease our percentage of student population who are chronically absent by 5% at the conclusion of the first semester in December of 2023. By the conclusion of the second semester in May 2024 we will reduce the percentage overall by 10% of chronically absent students.

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

The EWS report will be reviewed monthly by our MTSS Attendance Assistant Principal who will share those results with our school social worker, school counselor, SLT team and Administrative team. Stocktake meetings will be held to review data on October 4, 2023 and February 7, 2024.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracia Culver (teculver@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence based intervention for this area of focus will be our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports PBIS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

One of the three components of Atlantic High Schools PBIS System will be focused on being present at school. This component will be shared with students, staff and families throughout the year in communications and assemblies.

Person Responsible: Darlene Gariepy (dlgariep@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

School communication to students and families will include messaging about the importance of attending school daily.

Person Responsible: Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Student recognition and celebration for attendance weekly on Fridays to include music and prizes.

Person Responsible: Scott Wilson (sewilson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Description and Rationale: The Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Math proficiency increased from 2022 to 29%. The ELA proficiency increased from 2022 to 48%. This year we will continue to focus on our proficiency by increasing percentage of teachers delivering benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

By December 2023 50% of students in Math and 65% of students in ELA will meet proficiency on our district ELA and Math common assessments. By May 2024 60% of students in Math and 70% of students in ELA will meet proficiency on our district ELA and Math common assessments. Our coaches will be supporting all teachers but specifically tier 2 and tier 3 teachers. The percentage of teachers that require tier 2 or tier 3 support will reduce by 5% between semester 1 (December 2023) and semester 2 (May 2024). By May 2024 75% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, as evidenced through walkthroughs.

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

Data will be reviewed weekly by the Administration and the Instructional Coaches. Data will be shared with the Math and ELA teachers. The Instructional Coaches and Administrative Team will take part in the weekly PLC meetings for ELA 9, ELA 10, Algebra and Geometry. Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly as well and will focus on the 4 look-fors making sure instruction is aligned to the benchmarks. Stocktake meetings will be held to review data on October 4, 2023 and February 7, 2024.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Provide professional development framed with the Opportunity Myth in providing explicit benchmark-aligned instruction. Teachers providing the four look-fors will be rolled out in our school based ERPL's throughout the school year. Explicit Instruction is the first professional development being provided to teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success for all learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional Development will be provided during school based ERPL's which focus on teacher instruction and what it looks like when walking-through a classroom. This will include Explicit Instruction aligned to the benchmark, Tasks aligned to the benchmark, Questions being planned in advance to deepen understanding and Opportunities for students to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Sasha Williams (stwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 18, 2023 Explicit instruction December 6, 2023 Tasks aligned to benchmark January 24, 2024 Questions to deepen understanding March 13, 2024 Students opportunity to collaborate

Walkthroughs will be scheduled with administrators and academic coaches looking for the implementation of explicit instruction from professional development.

Person Responsible: Julian Doster (jedoster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

A benchmark bulletin board will be created and maintained in the academic coaches office to track planning and instruction in tested subject areas.

Person Responsible: Sasha Williams (stwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

American Recovery Plan (ARP) Grant will allow for our certified teacher to offer tutoring in ELA and MATH outside of the school day.

Person Responsible: Caleb Rich (cmrich@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Training for teachers on using the data dashboard to monitor student data as well as enter additional data related to individual student remediation.

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Student progress will be monitored weekly in PLC's by teachers, coaches and administration. Our leadership team will monitor student data in Stocktake meetings which will be held on October 4, 2023 and February 7, 2024.

Person Responsible: Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 and February 2024

School Wide Literacy Initiatives - Supported all year by AVID

Person Responsible: Melissa Rinaldi (mlrinald@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our students with disabilities are performing disproportionately lower than their non disabled peers in all areas of the school report card. The overall proficiency rate for our SWD in 2022 was 35%. Of considerate concern is the performance in ELA - only 24% of students meeting with proficiency and Math - only 11% of students meeting with proficiency. Additionally, the graduation rate for our students with disabilities was 16% lower than our school rate of 92%.

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

Professional learning plan will be implemented to provide teacher training on supportive strategies to increase literacy & support of ESE students, campus-wide. Teachers will implement supportive practices for students into their weekly lesson plans and document those supports in their weekly lesson planning sheets. Targeted coaching cycles will be established for any teachers demonstrating need. PLC meetings in core academic areas with a focus on ESE support will be implemented weekly. Strategic case management by ESE staff will occur weekly. As a result of implementation of these strategies, our SWD achievement will increase overall proficiency by 6% to a 41% proficiency rate

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

Quarterly admin/coaching data stock takes/SIP reviews will be conducted to look closely at ongoing data to identify students of concern that are failing to make adequate progress, teachers in need of coaching cycles, and areas where we can continue to grow in support of our ESE students.
Lesson plans will be submitted at the end of each quarter to VSET evaluators to ensure implementation and documentation of support strategies for SWD.
Walk throughs will also be conducted weekly by coaches and admin to collect data on implementation of support strategies/PD in class and identify teachers in need of further classroom supports which will be addressed through coaching cycles.
Admin will attend weekly PLC meetings to ensure fidelity of planning and accommodations implementation into weekly plans. PLC minutes are submitted to teacher leaders every Friday.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Response to Intervention as a part of MTSS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie. Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-tier approach to the identification and support of students with learning, behavior and attendance concerns. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and screening of all in the classroom. Struggling learners are provided with interventions and supports at increasing levels of intensity to accelerate their rate of learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Case management for SWD to include data chats & graduation progress monitoring

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

ESE teachers to include self-advocacy in weekly instruction

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

PLC work will include monitoring of SWD data and documentation of support in PLC minutes & teacher lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

ESE teachers will provide core teachers with printed copy of ESE accommodations for each student quarterly

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will implement ALL ESE accommodations outlined in IEP; request support for areas of concern

Person Responsible: Jenifer Linton (jklinton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will review rosters weekly to ensure accurate identification of ESE students in class; request accommodations when new students enters class

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will email case manager for additional supports when needed

Person Responsible: Jenifer Linton (jklinton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELL students are performing disproportionately lower than their peers in all areas of the school report card. The overall proficiency rate for our ELL was 39% in 2022.

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

Teachers will implement supportive literacy practices for ELL students into their weekly lesson plans and document those supports in their weekly lesson planning sheets. Targeted coaching cycles will be established for any teachers demonstrating need. Tutoring for ELL students for ACT will be provided. As a result of implementation of these strategies, our ELL students will increase overall proficiency by 5% to 44%.

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

Quarterly admin/coaching data stock takes/SIP reviews will be conducted to look closely at ongoing data to identify students of concern that are failing to make adequate progress, teachers in need of coaching cycles, and areas where we can continue to grow in support of our ELL population. Lesson plans will be submitted at the end of each quarter to VSET evaluators to ensure implementation and documentation of support strategies for our ELL students.
Walk throughs will also be conducted weekly by coaches and admin to collect data on implementation of support strategies/PD in class and identify teachers in need of further classroom supports which will be addressed through coaching cycles.
Tutoring sign in sheets will be reviewed to ensure students are attending.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Response to Intervention as a part of MTSS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie. Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-tier approach to the identification and support of students with learning, behavior and attendance concerns. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and screening of all in the classroom. Struggling learners are provided with interventions and supports at increasing levels of intensity to accelerate their rate of learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Case Management and weekly monitoring of progress for all ELL students

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Communication of ELL support strategies and expectations to faculty during a 1st semester faculty meeting and again in second semester.

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023 and January 2024

Early identification of ELL students that are struggling; support plans put into place by guidance counselor & monitored by ELL teacher

Person Responsible: Mallory Cone (mlcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2024