Galaxy Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Galaxy Middle School

2400 EUSTACE AVE, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/galaxymiddle/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.

Galaxy Middle School will empower ALL students towards achieving academic success through superior standards-aligned instruction, equity, collaborative practices, and positive educational experiences that will prepare students for high school and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Galaxy Middle School will work toward ensuring each student receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Velez, Eidie	Principal	
Goodin, Tony	Assistant Principal	
Swift, Tai	Assistant Principal	
Stemberger LaRuss, Rosemary	Assistant Principal	
Amaro, Leslie	Dean	
Krob, April	Instructional Coach	
Christian, Cisneros	Instructional Coach	
Carroll-Rhoden, Sheryl	Teacher, ESE	
Lopez-Toledo, Yelitz	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Through the use of surveys and our monthly SAC meetings we gain input from our stakeholders on the SIP development process.

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 plan will be monitored weekly through our leadership team meetings. We will also provide a review of the data throughout the school year in our SAC meetings for continuous input from stakeholders. Additionally we will continue to review the SIP in PLCs to discuss areas of need and review actions steps with all staff, as necessary.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* 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: C
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	97	90	88	275
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	82	122	253
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	7	4	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	12	48
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	126	135	373
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	94	105	301
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	6	3	56

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	84	105	122	311

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	16	14	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	6	23

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	103	116	85	304
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	118	85	292
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	34	18	73
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	43	55	109
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	137	133	392
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	147	150	449
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	64	46	178

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	125	151	127	403

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	25	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	15

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	116	85	304
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	118	85	292
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	34	18	73
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	43	55	109
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	137	133	392
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	147	150	449
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	64	46	178

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	151	127	403

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	25	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	15

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*	37	44	49	39	45	50	43		
ELA Learning Gains				40			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			32		
Math Achievement*	37	48	56	33	31	36	38		
Math Learning Gains				39			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			26		
Science Achievement*	40	49	49	51	46	53	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	67	68	59	49	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	48	62	73	54	43	49	58		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress	31	31	40	34	69	76	52		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	254
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	27	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	39	Yes	2	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

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	23	Yes	3	3
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	38	Yes	1	

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%**
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	37			37			40	61	48			31
SWD	12			13			15	26			5	13
ELL	17			19			20	41	36		6	31
AMI												
ASN	73			50							2	
BLK	34			29			32	47	41		5	
HSP	32			32			35	60	47		6	28
MUL	56			39			50	67	38		5	
PAC												
WHT	43			46			50	66	54		5	
FRL	32			31			35	59	40		6	27

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	39	40	33	33	39	40	51	59	54			34
SWD	8	27	29	12	32	34	13	20				31
ELL	22	35	27	16	33	33	28	31	45			34
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	31	34	24	23	37	42	27	49	25			
HSP	34	37	33	25	34	34	47	53	42			39
MUL	50	38		43	54			63	83			
PAC												
WHT	47	45	39	45	43	46	63	67	69			
FRL	35	38	31	27	36	37	44	55	46			32

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	43	42	32	38	27	26	50	57	58			52
SWD	6	18	19	8	13	15	12	21	46			38
ELL	29	33	26	28	26	18	23	54	69			52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	40	38	23	23	26	37	38	47			
HSP	39	37	27	31	25	23	43	57	53			53
MUL	29	33		28	33				50			
PAC												
WHT	53	49	37	51	30	31	62	67	64			
FRL	38	39	31	32	26	27	42	50	54			53

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	35%	44%	-9%	47%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	39%	-5%	47%	-13%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	34%	42%	-8%	47%	-13%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	49%	-4%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	30%	44%	-14%	48%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	37%	-11%	55%	-29%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	39%	47%	-8%	44%	-5%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	32%	21%	50%	3%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	39%	16%	48%	7%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	65%	-5%	66%	-6%

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.

Lowest overall performance was 8th grade math with a 26% proficiency. Contributing factors were staffing and large student achievement gap. During the 22-23 school year Galaxy had over 7 classroom vacancies throughout the school year in core academic areas, specifically ELA, Math, and reading. These core academic vacancies impacted student learning as there were inconsistencies on a day to day basis in classroom structures, classroom routines, behavioral expectations, instructional planning, and with the overall quality of instruction. This resulted in low academic performance in Math and ELA proficiency.

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

Greatest decline in proficiency was 8th grade science. 2021-22 Science students scored 48% proficiency; there was a decrease of 9 points. During the 2022-23 school year 39% proficiency. Factors that contributed to this decline were staffing issues; when this cohort was in 6th grade, it was a COVID year which resulted in loss of learning. When this group of students were in 7th and in 8th grade they had brand new teachers with lack of experience in both classroom management and in the content area. This resulted in a lack of quality of instruction, resulting in a decline in academic proficiency.

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.

The subject area with the greatest gap compared to the state is 8th grade math with a 26% proficiency, while the state average was 55% proficiency. Factors that contributed to this gap include lack of quality and focused instruction due to vacancies in math. Lack of quality instruction in math resulted limited student academic progress.

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

During the 2022-23 school year, the subject area with the great improvement is 8th grade math. During the 2021-22 school year 8th grade scored 13% proficiency. During the 2022-23 8th grade showed a13 point increase with a 26% proficiency. 6th grade math during the 2021-22 school showed 34% proficiency, making a 11 point increase with the 45% proficiency during 2022-23. This can be attributed to the small group instruction and a variety of tutoring programs that were implemented before and after school. Hiring of teachers, strategic planning, and focused instruction resulted in an increase in academic achievement.

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

Reflecting on the EWS date from 2022-23, two areas of concern are number of out of schoolsuspensions and attendance.

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

Our highest priorities to impact student performance are: ELA, Math, Attendance, Out of School Suspensions

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.

PBIS Behavior Invervention and Support: improve and integrate data, systems, and practices to positively affect student outcomes. Based on EWS greatest areas of concern, 275 EWS students have a 90% or less attendance and 253 EWS students have 1 or more suspensions.

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

By December of 2023, 80% of Galaxy faculty and staff will consistently implement the PBIS strategies and rewards which will increase attendance by 10% and decrease suspensions by 30%.

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

-PBIS Rewards App will be utilized by faculty and staff and usage will be monitored. PBIS Team will monitor attendance data and quarterly suspension data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leslie Amaro (lamaro@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.)

PBIS focuses on improving our school's ability to teach and support positive skills and behavior for all students. By helping students practice good behavior, we will build a strong community in which all students can succeed and grow.

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

The findings for Racial equity through Assessing data for vulnerable decision points, Culturally responsive behavior strategies, and Teaching about implicit bias and how to neutralize it (ReACT) is recognized as promising on Whatworksclearninghouse.com.

Equity Focused PBIS Approach Reduces Racial Inequalities in School Discipline: A Randomized Controlled Trial, McIntosh, Kent; Girvan, Erik J.; Fairbanks Falcon, Sarah; McDaniel, Sara C.; Smolkowski, Keith; Bastable, Eoin; Santiago-Rosario, María Reina; Izzard, Sara; Austin, Sean C.; Nese, Rhonda N. T.; Baldy, Tabathia S. (2021). School Psychology, v36 n6 p433-444. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1316009

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.

Our PBIS Team will train faculty and staff regarding PBIS strategies, expectations, and rewards to deepen their understanding of PBIS initiatives.

Person Responsible: Yelitz Lopez-Toledo (ylopezto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 8, 2023

PBIS Team will meet monthly and review data. They will provide feedback on the areas of greatest concern.

Person Responsible: Yelitz Lopez-Toledo (ylopezto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly PBIS team meeting

Will provide support to teachers who are not using PBIS strategies based on walkthroughs and/or observations.

Person Responsible: Leslie Amaro (lamaro@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout 23-24 school year. Support through PLC based on data from PBIS Team meeting and ongoing support through coaching cycles.

#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.

Our Science, ELA, and Math data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark. Our subgroups that will be addressed are SWD, black, hispanic, ELL, and economically disadvantaged.

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

Student Practice: By January 2024, students in multiple subgroups will be able to score a 50% or higher on district assessments and progress monitoring state assessment. By June 2024, students in multiple subgroups will be able to score a 60% or higher on district assessments and progress monitoring state assessments.

After administration of PM 1 and 2, students will show academic growth in comparison to state averages.

Teacher Practice: By October 2023, 80% of teachers will engage students in benchmark aligned tasks as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice: By May 2024, the number of teachers requiring Tier 2 and 3 support will decrease by at least 60%.

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

Student Practice: PM 1 and 2 student data will be analyzed by students as well as teachers and identify areas of needs and focus for student success.

Teacher Practice: This will be monitored by classroom walkthroughs utilizing the Look For walkthrough tool to identify benchmark aligned instruction. Administrators and coaches are assigned to subject area PLCs in order to monitor planning practices aligned to benchmarks.

Coaching Practice: Administration and coaches will meet on a weekly basis in order to discuss coaching cycles, review trends, and refine coaching plan. Administration will monitor coaching plan and provide feedback to coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Eidie Velez (evelez@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.)

Providing weekly opportunities for collaboration through PLCs, focused planning, professional learning opportunities facilitated by instructional coaches and instructional leaders to create heightened content based learning, allow for benchmark aligned instruction and increase student achievement.

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

Research has shown that qualify professional development is a key school-based factor that influences student outcomes, including student achievement.
Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as

evidenced by Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Professional development Validation Study Meyers, Coby V.; Molefe, Ayrin; Brandt, W. Christopher; Zhu, Bo; Dhillon, Sonica (2016). Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, v38 n3 p455-476. Retrieved from : https;//eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1108395.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

-Create a master schedule that allows for common planning
-Create a planning tool to define expectations for before, during, and after planning to include Look Fors

Person Responsible: Tai Swift (tlswift@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

-Instructional coaches and administrators will facilitate weekly PLCs to assure that the discussion is centered around benchmark aligned instruction, Look Fors, and that notes are being taken.

Person Responsible: April Krob (adkrob@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, weekly

-Instructional coaches and administrators will facilitate weekly PLCs to assure that the discussion is centered around benchmark aligned instruction, Look Fors, and that notes are being taken.

Person Responsible: April Krob (adkrob@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, weekly

Provide coaches feedback based on Look For walkthrough data based on the coaching support plan.

Person Responsible: Rosemary Stemberger LaRuss (rstembe1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing, weekly

Administrative team will complete weekly walkthroughs and meet weekly to discuss trends and make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible: Rosemary Stemberger LaRuss (rstembe1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing, weekly

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP is reviewed by SAC, several copies are placed in the front office and media center for parents to view. It is also posted on the school website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Galaxy builds positive relationships with parents by involving them in school events such as Open House, school dances, field trips, cross country meetings, basketball games, field days, awards assemblies.

Parents are informed by our Connect Ed messages, the school website, the school Facebook page, flyers, and Parent Portal, parent phone calls, and parent conferences.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Administrators and coaches plan to be in classrooms on a weekly basis and provide feedback to teachers. To increase the amount of learning time, students are limited in the number of times they leave the classroom. Benchmark-aligned instruction is being promoted through using the Look For walkthrough tool.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No