Heritage Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Heritage Middle School

1001 PARNELL CT, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/heritagemiddle/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.

Heritage Middle School will ignite a passion for learning while maximizing student potential one student at a time.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The spirit of Heritage Middle School embodies a community of students, parents and staff working together. We believe in providing a safe and secure student-centered environment that elevates respect and rapport and empowers all to soar to the highest levels of personal and academic excellence.

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
Atkinson, Jami	Instructional Coach	
Bidwell, Elizabeth	Math Coach	
Fidance, Nick	Principal	
Dutil, Denielle	Assistant Principal	
Hemke, Kim	Other	
Leonard, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Crim, Stephanie	Dean	
Klein, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Sheridan, Allison	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.

The SIP was reviewed with the faculty during pre-planning meetings. SIP was presented to School Advisory Committee as well as our Title I parent meeting. SAC provided feedback and input with regard to the SIP in our August 2023 SAC meeting. Parents will also be able to view the SIP through the main office.

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))

Area 1 Focus will be monitored through walk-throughs "looks-fors" which include 4 teacher components, PLC's, coaching cycles, and formal/informal observations. Structured daily administrative observations are scheduled.

Area 2 focus will be monitored through our PBIS committee and SLT meetings.

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)* 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	89	70	109	268
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	76	96	215
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	22	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	29	80	123
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	120	149	370
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	117	121	338
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	50	44	146

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	71	91	144	306

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	7	3	14	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	13

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	67	81	69	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	98	85	277
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	39	27	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	46	14	98
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	154	138	416
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	140	112	386
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	78	60	173

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	114	127	111	352

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	6	12	13	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	11

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	67	81	69	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	98	85	277
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	39	27	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	46	14	98
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	154	138	416
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	140	112	386
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	78	60	173

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	114	127	111	352

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	6	12	13	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	11

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*	40	44	49	36	45	50	42		
ELA Learning Gains				36			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			35		
Math Achievement*	46	48	56	42	31	36	40		
Math Learning Gains				53			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			32		
Science Achievement*	49	49	49	55	46	53	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	67	68	62	49	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	78	62	73	80	43	49	75		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress	15	31	40	52	69	76	35		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	298
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	18	Yes	4	2
ELL	26	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	45			
HSP	48			
MUL	37	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	46			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	49			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	40			46			49	70	78			15
SWD	15			21			12	44			5	0
ELL	20			22			18	53			5	15
AMI												
ASN	60			70							2	
BLK	29			35			33	66	60		5	
HSP	39			43			47	72	72		6	13
MUL	35			24			45	45			4	
PAC												
WHT	45			55			60	72	83		5	
FRL	34			42			43	65	75		6	14

| | | | | | | | 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	36	36	31	42	53	51	55	62	80			52
SWD	13	29	26	15	40	46	29	27				25
ELL	18	29	35	24	45	41	33	50				52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	34	29	26	51	52	47	54	69			
HSP	32	36	33	41	54	55	51	61	78			52
MUL	27	38		38	56		62	70				
PAC												
WHT	47	38	32	50	53	49	62	65	84			
FRL	31	35	31	38	52	50	51	59	76			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	42	43	35	40	33	32	59	57	75			35
SWD	10	28	30	10	27	27	17	25				25
ELL	23	40	36	26	30	29	39	34				35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	34	39	29	25	24	51	49	75			
HSP	37	44	38	35	31	41	44	49	62			33
MUL	52	52		36	32		75					
PAC												
WHT	49	43	30	47	37	31	69	67	81			
FRL	38	39	32	36	31	30	58	51	68			36

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	34%	44%	-10%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	39%	-5%	47%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	42%	-3%	47%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	44%	49%	-5%	54%	-10%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	48%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	37%	-6%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	32%	58%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	39%	61%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	65%	0%	66%	-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.

Our ELA component is our lowest. Some contributing factors include losing our instructional coach in October and departmental turnover over the last few years. Turnover has an impact on instructional practice by not allowing time

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

The component that had the greatest decline from the prior year was science moving from 55% to 48%. We contribute this a district-wide drop due to missing the 5th grade State Assessment and review. The low ELA component also effected our Science data due to lack of reading ability.

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 largest gap between Heritage and the state averages is in math specifically in 8th grade where there was a 24% difference between Heritage (31%) and the state (55%). However, due to our scores in geometry and algebra being so high (100% and 92%, respectively), it compensated for our lower-scoring 8th graders in math. Some factors that contributed to the gap include teachers being able to teach to the depth of the standards which caused a lack of maintaining the pace of the curriculum map given by the district. Both factors can be monitored through PLCs and walk-throughs this year to prevent the gap going forward.

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

Specifically algebra and geometry and its impact on our acceleration component. We utilized ALEKS and multiple teachers were added to teach Algebra. Student placement and monitoring student progress added to the success of our most improved component.

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

One potential area of concern is the number of students who scored level 1's in both ELA and Math. We need to focus on our lower quartile students to ensure they are receiving the support(s) needed to make learning gains.

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

1. ELA- improve instruction
2. SWD and lower-quartile students
3. Overall reduce the number of overall suspensions and discipline

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 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.

Classroom walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark, as only 40% of teachers delivered benchmark-aligned instruction. Additionally, our Needs Assessment and Analysis, revealed that only 35.6% of our students reached proficiency in ELA and 40.4% in Math. With an increased focus aligned instruction and tasks, student proficiency will increase on state assessments.

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

By February 2024, 75% of the students will be able to score a 70% or higher on our district ELA, math, science, and civic common assessments. By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, as evidenced through walkthroughs. By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support decreased by 80%.

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

School leadership team (including Academic coaches) will review lesson plans weekly to provide support and feedback to teachers as they are preparing to deliver instruction. (PLC's) School content coaches will be present in common planning to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned. School leadership team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning. The leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denielle Dutil (dldutil@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 is small group learning which according to John Hattie yields a .47 effect size.

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

Due to our Students with Disabilities needing interventions, we can utilize small group instruction to differentiate instruction based on each individual student's needs.

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.

Instructional coaches with administration will facilitate weekly grade-level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark-aligned lessons.

Person Responsible: Nick Fidance (ntfidanc@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Continuously August 2023-May 2024

Instructional Coaches and Administration will collaboratively review lesson plans and provide feedback at least one week ahead of when lessons will be presented.

Person Responsible: Nick Fidance (ntfidanc@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Continuously August 2023-May 2024

Provide coaching support based on walkthrough data using look-fors through tiered coaching support plan developed with trends.

Person Responsible: Jami Atkinson (jatkinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Professional Learning for small group learning

Person Responsible: Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly during ERPL's

coaches will model the implementation of instructional frameworks, instructional practices, and utilization of student tasks aligned to benchmarks during the planning and indicate the support plan (focus, frequency and method of support) and next steps in coaching log.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Bidwell (emmartin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: It will vary based on the tiering of teacher needs. Coaching logs will be monitored weekly by the administration.

The School Leadership Team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Nick Fidance (ntfidanc@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

The leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible: Nick Fidance (ntfidanc@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

#2. 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.

Data indicates that 26% of our students were absent over 10% of the 2022-23 school year. 89-6th graders 70-7th graders 109-8th graders

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

By May of 2024, 85% of our students will be present 90% of the school year.

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

Monitor monthly through monthly PBIS meetings where we will discuss trends and specific students, including pre-identified students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denielle Dutil (dldutil@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.)

Staff using PBIS app to give rewards for SOAR. Team Leaders and guidance counselors will reach out to parents/students with high absences.

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

High absences lead to behavior problems and low test scores.

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.

Provide training on PBIS website to staff.

Person Responsible: Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: ERPL in December.

PBIS will meet monthly to review attendance.

Person Responsible: Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Team Leaders will have perfect attendance awards/incentives.

Person Responsible: Denielle Dutil (dldutil@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

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).

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