

Volusia County Schools

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

David C. Hinson Sr. Middle School

1860 N CLYDE MORRIS BLVD, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
------	----------------	---------------------------------

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 will meet every other week on Thursdays. Through discussion, ideas will be generated and then shared through teams, departments, and PLC meetings. In those meetings, discussions will be held with information brought back to SLT.

SAC Meetings will be advertised to stakeholders, with requests for information and/or ideas to improve the school. Information will be shared by the school with those attending the meeting. Students will be invited to participate in SAC, as we had some last year.

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))

Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs to observe the four Look Fors taking place during instruction. SIP midyear review will take place to analyze current data and trends. SLT and our Academic Coach will analyze data from testing windows. Our coach will push into the classrooms needing it for support.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
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: A
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	60	62	63	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	50	60	133
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	20	44
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	19	44
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	104	99	266
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	74	106	233
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

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	47	74	71	192

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	2	6	5	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5

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							59	76	70	205
One or more suspensions							55	68	34	157
Course failure in ELA							10	27	11	48
Course failure in Math							11	16	12	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							95	105	85	285
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							122	96	73	291
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.							68	56	46	170

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	

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	59	76	70	205
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	68	34	157
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	27	11	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	12	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	105	85	285
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	96	73	291
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	56	46	170

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	52	44	49	48	45	50	50		
ELA Learning Gains				44			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			24		
Math Achievement*	56	48	56	49	31	36	54		
Math Learning Gains				50			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			29		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	53	49	49	55	46	53	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	67	68	74	49	58	71		
Middle School Acceleration	75	62	73	75	43	49	75		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress		31	40	50	69	76	67		

* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	23	Yes	4	2
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	44			
HSP	56			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	53			

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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	47			

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	52			56			53	75	75			
SWD	14			19			18	39			4	
ELL	42			42				67			3	
AMI												
ASN	78			78			67	94	96		5	
BLK	34			32			24	71	61		5	
HSP	45			51			52	63	71		5	
MUL	53			57			45	68			4	
PAC												
WHT	56			62			61	78	75		5	
FRL	43			45			42	69	66		5	

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	48	44	27	49	50	47	55	74	75			50
SWD	16	22	18	18	36	36	24	33				
ELL	40	45	27	33	38	38	21					50
AMI												
ASN	79	73		75	73		69	87	79			
BLK	25	33	26	28	42	44	35	52	67			
HSP	40	36	19	34	45	48	28	75	55			
MUL	44	56		53	47		69	73	73			
PAC												
WHT	54	44	27	55	52	47	64	80	76			
FRL	40	42	29	40	47	47	45	66	68			

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	50	46	24	54	43	29	56	71	75			67
SWD	18	28	16	22	40	29	23	32				
ELL	28	48	70	33	50	33		47				67

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
AMI												
ASN	77	66		81	63		89	93	87			
BLK	32	30	15	33	40	35	47	63	68			
HSP	26	38	36	35	41	33	33	33				77
MUL	61	56		56	50	18	56		59			
PAC												
WHT	55	49	26	59	41	26	57	76	76			
FRL	40	39	23	44	40	29	43	64	63			71

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
07	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	39%	6%	47%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	42%	5%	47%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	48%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	37%	5%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	44%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	32%	59%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	39%	59%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	66%	9%

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.

SWD - ELA (16%), MATH (18%)
 Contributing factors - vacancies, lack of ESE services provided to students, lack of training for teachers, teacher retention, consistency, shift from paper to digital led to more distractions for the students, lack of engagement/critical thinking (passive "learning")

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

SWD - MATH dropped 22 --> 18; ELA 18 --> 16
 ELL - ELA 28 -->, math stayed the same
 AA - down 7 in ELA (32-->25), 5 in math (33-->28)

Contributing factors - lack of classroom management, scaffolding, differentiation, rigor, engagement/relationship building; teacher turnover; lack of consistency, new standards implemented at increased rigor

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.

This information is taken from the FLDOE website.
 8th grade math - The state average pass rate was 55%, while Hinson's eighth graders had 42% pass rate.
 7th grade math - The state average pass rate was 48%, while Hinson's seventh graders had a 49% pass

rate.

6th grade math - The state average pass rate was 54%, while Hinson's sixth graders had 50% pass rate.

Both general education teachers left as the year progressed in 8th grade. In 6th grade, one of the teachers left at Spring Break, while the year started with a teacher retiring at the end of August and the vacancy not being filled for several weeks. In our seventh grade vacancy, there was a permanent sub who was not granted access to online materials needed for the online textbook. The paper version of the textbook does not have sufficient practice materials.

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

This information was gathered using the FLDOE website.

Algebra - The state average pass rate was 54%, while Hinson's students had a 91% pass rate.

Geometry - The state average pass rate was 49%, while Hinson's students had a 98% pass rate.

New Actions: New teacher, both teachers stayed the entire year (one was out a lot and then left before the end of the year during the 2021-2022 school year), both were consistent with their attendance, helping our Algebra students succeed.

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

There were more math course failures this year than last year (44 vs 39). This corresponds with the increase in students earning at a level 1 in Math compared to their performance the year prior, though some of this may be attributable to the increased rigor of the new standards. New teacher and teacher turnover were also factors in this increase in course failures.

Our current 7th graders had an increase in the number of students (104) earning a level 1 on their testing compared to the year prior, when only 95 students performed at a level 1 as 6th graders. One reason may be that BEST standards were implemented completely this year.

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

Student achievement:

- AA
- SWD
- ELL

Subject areas assessed:

- ELA
- Math

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**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.

In order to best serve our students' needs, our faculty needs to deepen their toolbox of strategies. This will allow teachers to offer students a variety of learning opportunities to meet their learning deficits and harness their strengths according to Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI).

Examples of on-campus training include:

- Engagement Strategies
- Classroom Management
- Assessments/using formative instruction to drive instruction
- Gradebook
- Universal Design for Learning
- Grouping strategies
- Canvas
- Note-taking strategies

New teachers will participate in the district-wide mentoring program. Mentoring our new teachers through the VCS New Teacher Academy with systematic support through professional collaboration, differentiated to meet the need of each new teacher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers participate in the coaching and learning opportunities related to task alignment with benchmarks with fidelity, district and state assessment scores will show growth, depending on the assessment.

Example: ELA pass rate of 50% at the end of last year will grow to 52% in PM 1 of this year.

Monitoring:

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

Hinson Middle School will use FAST Progress Monitoring Data, DIAs, VBAs, and reading progress monitoring programs available to measure growth in students' progress. VSET, learning walks, coach observations, and walk-throughs will also be used to observe evidence of professional learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@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.)

If there is evidence of teachers struggling with the learning initiatives, interventions can be offered through coaching by an academic coach, department chairs, district specialists, and peers in PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using a variety of willing and experienced teachers may be less intimidating to colleagues who are struggling, with the hope that they will be more open to trying new strategies.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Based on the data gathered through testing, three subgroups have been targeted as a demographic on which to focus improved instructional practices.

DATA GATHERED:**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

16% ELA
 18% Math
 24% Science
 33% Soc St
 -% acceleration
 Federal index - 25

BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

25% ELA
 28% Math
 35% Science
 52% Soc St
 67% acceleration
 Federal index - 39

ELL STUDENTS

40% ELA
 33% Math
 21% Science
 -% Soc St
 -% acceleration
 ELP progress - 50
 Federal index - 37

IDENTIFIED BARRIERS IN THE PAST YEAR:

SWD - Some classrooms did not have co-teachers; new teachers were hired
 ELL - did not have an ELL teacher in the 2022-2023 school year
 Multiple - ERPLs were lost, with hindered our MTSS trainings; Math had a vacancy in each grade level; Vacancies for part of the year in each grade in ELA - 2 in 6th grade

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS:

Hired an ELL Reading teacher for the 2023-2024 school year
 ELA curriculum maps have been rewritten to be more specific; differentiation and extension activities are embedded in the curriculum map for each lesson; HMH activities provided; curriculum map includes opportunities for small groups to support instruction when students are struggling
 Math has specific questions to guide the students and teachers in each lesson; All but 1 math vacancy filled
 Pull out groups
 More small groups; stations within the classroom
 Mentoring new teachers to increase retention rates
 Focus on levels of questioning as teachers plan their lessons in PLCs, possibly scripting the different question levels as needed with discussion of anticipated answers and how to progress through scaffolding

to higher level questioning
Incorporate learning from GROUPING trainings to increase and improve the quality of student collaboration

Measurable Outcome:

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

Scores will increase in ELA and Math during each Progress Monitoring window by at least 2% for each subgroup being monitored.

Monitoring:

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

We will use FSA data, DIAs, VBAs, and other progress monitoring tools available to measure growth in students' progress. VSET, learning walks, coach observations, and walk-throughs will also be used to observe evidence of professional learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Dunnigan (wrdunnig@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.)

Small group instruction

Differentiation

Reteaching

Tutoring at teacher discretion

Mentoring

Increased rigor and quality of questioning by teacher

Increased quality and quantity of student collaboration

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction targets student deficits in a more tailored way to meet their needs

Differentiation allows for a variety of methods for students to learn or relearn information

Reteaching allows students who did not grasp concepts at the proficient level to try again

Tutoring at teacher discretion to allow students more time to grasp concepts, sometimes in one-on-one settings

Mentoring will help retain teachers

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Using discipline data, our administrative and school leadership teams determined that we need to continue focusing on our Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support System (PBIS), refining it as we move into our second year on our campus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through the systematic and intentional implementation of the PBIS system campus-wide from the first quarter, the positive behaviors will be tracked in the software (pending approval of funding). As a result, the number of discipline issues is anticipated to decline: measured by referral data, lunch detentions, and incident reports.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data is monitored through FOCUS - referrals, detentions, and incident reports. These will be reviewed quarterly to find where we are succeeding and where there is a need for more support. Positive Behavior data is monitored through PBIS software.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shelby Flowers (slflowe1@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.)

Use of PBIS updated software (school purchase pending approval)
Implementation of PBIS strategies
Support for teachers who need clarification on strategies and implementation

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Being consistent in implementing PBIS, including using software to support our efforts, will result in a positive learning environment for our students. This will address several other concerns, leading to academic gains.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding allocations will be tied to the school improvement plan and curriculum needs. The school improvement requests will be presented to SAC for review and discussion. The members of SAC will then evaluate and decide on funding.