

Volusia County Schools

Holly Hill School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	31
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	33

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/hollyhill/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.

At Holly Hill School the heart of our work is safety, resiliency, smooth daily operations, and meaningful instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Holly Hill School will ignite a passion for learning and develop scholars to become productive citizens in a dynamic, 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
Voges, Robert	Principal	Facilitate School Improvement Plan; Distribute Leadership; Monitor Implementation; PBIS; Benchmark-aligned Instruction Campus-wide; ELL; 3-8 Proficiency;
Zablo, Michael	Assistant Principal	Stocktake Facilitator; 6-8 Proficiency; 6-8 Teaming; School-wide Data and Assessment; PBIS; Benchmark-aligned Instruction Campus-wide
Gadson, Beverly	School Counselor	6-8 Proficiency; 6-8 Resiliency; PBIS & MTSS
Robinson, Charlise	Math Coach	6-8 Math Proficiency; AVID; WICOR Strategies; 6-8 Thinking Maps; 6-8 Teaming & PLC Facilitation
Friedman, Stephanie	Math Coach	K-5 Math Proficiency; Assessment; Implementing Benchmark-aligned Instruction; PBIS
Dubrulle, Lisa	Reading Coach	K-5 Reading Proficiency; Early Literacy; Implementing Benchmark-aligned Instruction in ELA; PBIS; School-wide Literacy Initiatives
Glaenzer, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	ESE Services and Compliance; MTSS Process; Benchmark-aligned instruction for ESE scholars; PBIS
Lowery, Katherine	Assistant Principal	SIP Chair; K-5 Proficiency; PBIS; Benchmark-aligned Instruction Campus-wide
Wilson, Melissa	Dean	Resiliency Squad; PBIS

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.

Our first level beyond our SIP SLT is our full-school SLT that meets monthly and includes teacher leaders from all grade levels and departments including ELL, ESE, and MTSS/Counseling. This larger SLT reviews the SIP and is responsible for providing voice to the plan. SLT monitors implementation of the plan and recommends amendments to the plan or changes to action steps. The SIP development and monitoring is also shared with our School Advisory Council which is made up of parents, community members, and teachers. Further beyond the walls of the school, Principal Voges presents to the Holly Hill City Commission and Chamber of Commerce and has already shared our plans with Leadership Daytona and The Greater Daytona Chamber of Commerce. He also meets regularly with the Early Learning Coalition to collaborate on our SIP action steps.

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))

Instructional leaders will walk classrooms using benchmark-aligned resources and common tools to determine implementation of strategies and use district and state assessment data to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional action plan steps. The VCS Leadership Dashboard will be used to monitor student data. Weekly Instructional Leadership Team and Administrative meetings along with the monthly SLT monitoring will be supported with 2 Stock Take sessions to monitor progress and amend action steps and outcomes. Input from all areas (ELL, ESE, K-2, 3-5, 6-8) will be analyzed along with "look-fors" from classroom walks.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: C 2018-19: C 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	23	50	48	63	33	54	34	47	39	391	
One or more suspensions	0	13	23	36	17	48	36	67	64	304	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	5	2	14	6	7	14	48	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	16	2	7	2	32	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	48	62	51	70	57	325	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	66	71	36	38	55	266	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	0	8	2	8	44	57	39	165	
	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	7	11	40	15	70	43	67	62	315

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	2	3	4	38	0	1	0	7	10	65	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3	9	

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	30	54	47	53	42	27	36	42	55	386	
One or more suspensions	2	29	8	23	34	31	41	67	74	309	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	11	12	6	4	14	51	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	4	11	6	15	41	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	47	41	50	54	60	271	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	59	33	42	62	73	284	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	6	9	1	51	52	55	176	

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	1	7	6	27	54	37	41	68	76	317

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	19	1	0	1	1	1	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	5

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	30	54	47	53	42	27	36	42	55	386	
One or more suspensions	2	29	8	23	34	31	41	67	74	309	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	11	12	6	4	14	51	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	4	11	6	15	41	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	47	41	50	54	60	271	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	59	33	42	62	73	284	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	6	9	1	51	52	55	176	

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	1	7	6	27	54	37	41	68	76	317

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	19	1	0	1	1	1	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	5

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*	29	48	53	29	49	55	34		
ELA Learning Gains				34			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				26			35		
Math Achievement*	30	45	55	30	32	42	28		
Math Learning Gains				50			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			26		
Science Achievement*	38	56	52	44	45	54	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	46	64	68	58	52	59	57		
Middle School Acceleration	43	53	70	73	44	51	71		
Graduation Rate		76	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		43	53		62	70			
ELP Progress	62	58	55	41	68	70	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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
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	9	Yes	4	4
ELL	25	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	4	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	43			
PAC				

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%
WHT	41			
FRL	40	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%
SWD	24	Yes	3	3
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	44			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	42			

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	29			30			38	46	43			62
SWD	6			5			12	13			5	
ELL	11			21			27	31			6	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			23			25	50	33		6	
HSP	25			33			33	43			6	61

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
MUL	36			26			67				3	
PAC												
WHT	35			38			53	43	42		6	
FRL	28			29			37	47	47		7	63

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	29	34	26	30	50	50	44	58	73			41
SWD	5	20	28	5	42	49	16	31				17
ELL	20	41	50	24	46	38	62	25				41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	30	22	22	47	54	29	49	50			
HSP	27	42	50	35	50	39	63	45				43
MUL	36	27		38	58		50	82				
PAC												
WHT	37	36	22	36	54	50	54	71	74			
FRL	27	33	25	28	48	47	42	55	74			42

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	34	42	35	28	35	26	44	57	71			52
SWD	7	26	27	4	25	26	30	33				50
ELL	39	67	58	27	35	20	61					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	35	27	20	32	25	33	53	50			
HSP	37	60	50	31	33	24	56	82	70			52
MUL	38	71		43	43							
PAC												
WHT	41	38	33	32	37	35	46	53	83			

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
FRL	32	41	36	26	35	26	42	58	68			49

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
05	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	54%	-27%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	44%	-10%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	39%	-11%	47%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	25%	57%	-32%	58%	-33%
06	2023 - Spring	27%	42%	-15%	47%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	50%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	26%	49%	-23%	54%	-28%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	44%	-2%	48%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	23%	57%	-34%	59%	-36%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	59%	-32%	61%	-34%
08	2023 - Spring	18%	37%	-19%	55%	-37%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	47%	-14%	44%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	61%	-22%	51%	-12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	32%	15%	50%	-3%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	65%	-21%	66%	-22%

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.

In the 22-23 school year, our lowest performing data component was ELA Achievement. As a K-8 school we had 29% of our students demonstrating proficiency on the PM 3 Assessment. This was a decrease of 11 percentage points from the previous school year. We experienced significant turnover in teachers and hired several instructional staff that were out of field or lacking certification. Teachers demonstrated a lack of understanding regarding the benchmarks and therefore were not able to prepare students adequately. The turnover in teachers also led to significant discipline issues resulting in students missing instructional time.

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

The most significant decrease occurred in Middle School Acceleration. 49% of our students earned an acceleration point which is a decrease of 24% decrease from the previous year (76). We experienced multiple turnovers in the Algebra/Geometry classroom resulting in a loss of instruction. We also struggled to find certified teachers in several of the middle school math classrooms.

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.

Overall our Math scores were significantly below the state. For example, our 8th grade Math proficiency was 18% whereas our district was 33% and 55% at the state level. Our school struggled with staffing adequately prepared teachers last year. Of our 4 math teachers in the middle school division, only 1 was a math teacher. The others were new to teaching and 2 of those positions were held by multiple teachers

and substitutes leading to inconsistency in instruction along with a lack of knowledge of the benchmarks and instructional practice. This was the case in many other grade levels where the lack of classroom efficacy, particularly classroom management as evidenced by over 4,300 referrals, negatively impacted student achievement. Even our High School Algebra/Geometry classes had inconsistency and were traumatized by teacher movement.

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

Our Math proficiency showed an increase of 2 percentage points from the 21-22 school year to the 23-24 school year, growing from 30% to 32%. This increase was driven by a meteoric rise in 7th grade math proficiency from 3% to 43% and in 5th from 1% to 27% when comparing FSA 22 to FAST 23. 7th grade was the only grade level with a veteran math teacher (3 years experience) and our 5th grade math teachers are both veterans with consistent, standards-aligned practices. The hiring of the 7th grade math teacher was intentional because of her structured efficacy with benchmark aligned planning. We also had additional intervention and coaching support pushed to 5th grade math to bolster direct & group instruction.

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

Attendance and # of referrals/suspensions are the two areas resulting in the most concern or alarm. We must keep students in class.

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

1. Meaningful instruction that is aligned to the benchmarks and drives scholars to deeper knowledge
2. Smooth daily operations that maximize resources and promote bell to bell learning
3. Relationships between all stakeholders that create resiliency and enhance learning
4. Safety, security, and wellness of all stakeholders

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 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.

Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (improve and integrate data, systems, and practices to positively affect student outcomes).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measure # of students on EWS from year to year, ideally having a decrease in students on the report from 23-24 in comparison to 22-23. In the 22-23 school year, 4,878 referrals were written. We would like to decrease referrals by 45% in the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly PBIS meeting to review problem areas. (Rosen)

6th-8th middle school teaming meetings to occur weekly that address MTSS needs. (Zablo)

K-5 monthly PLC meeting dedicated to MTSS review (attendance, academics, and behavior). (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson, Gadson, Bivins, and Linder)

Monthly MTSS support session with MTSS Chair to occur on a rotational basis during CPT time (K-2 1st week of month, 3rd-5th 2nd week of the month, 6th-8th 3rd week of the month, 4th week of the month Stocktake with Admin). (Edwards/Admin)

Continue implementation of the House system to encourage positive behavior as well as academic performance amongst our students. (Lowrey)

Established the Resiliency Squad to promote a focus on instructional minutes. (Wilson)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS)

Multi Tiered System and Supports (MTSS)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a systems approach to establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success.

A strong multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) empowers educators to use evidence-based practices to meet the social-emotional, behavioral, and academic needs of all students.

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.

Monthly PBIS meeting to review problem areas. (Rosen)

Person Responsible: Stephanie Glaenger (swglaenz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

6th-8th middle school teaming meetings to occur weekly that address MTSS needs. (Zablo)

Person Responsible: Michael Zablo (mgzablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

K-5 monthly PLC meeting dedicated to MTSS review (attendance, academics, and behavior). (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson, Gadson, Bivins, and Linder)

Person Responsible: Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Monthly MTSS support session with MTSS Chair to occur on a rotational basis during CPT time (K-2 1st week of month, 3rd-5th 2nd week of the month, 6th-8th 3rd week of the month, 4th week of the month Stocktake with Admin). (Edwards/Admin)

Person Responsible: Robert Voges (rvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Working to rebuild and re-establish the family culture and morale at Holly Hill School. We plan to hold 4 Saturday community events throughout the course of the school year to build relationships with the families that we serve.

Person Responsible: Robert Voges (rvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 31st, 2024.

Continue implementation of the House system to encourage positive behavior as well as academic performance amongst our students.

Person Responsible: Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 31st, 2023.

Established the Resiliency Squad to promote a focus on instructional minutes.

Person Responsible: Melissa Wilson (mcwilso1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 31st, 2023.

#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.

School performance data and classroom walkthrough data indicate a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark, as only 29% of students achieved proficiency in ELA and 32% in Math. With an increased focus on 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 May 2024, 42% of the students in 3rd-5th grade groups will be able to score a 70% or higher on the state FAST ELA and Math 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 # of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 coaching support will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly PLCs will be facilitated by our Academic Coaches and Grade Level Leaders with a focus on data analysis. We will use formative and summative data to determine if interventions and Tier 1 instruction is working, and develop fluid plans along the way to target the needs of the students as well as teacher support needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Voges (rvoges@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.)

Collaborative Planning (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Holly Hill Learns (Lowrey)
 Weekly PLCs (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Master Schedule allotted for common planning and PLCs (Glanezer)
 Thinking Maps (Lowrey)
 Intervention Support Schedule with highly qualified Teachers (DuBrule)
 Walk Through Schedule (Lowrey)
 Weekly Instructional Leadership Meeting (Voges)
 Friday Admin Meeting (Voges)
 Tutoring (Wilson)
 Academic Clubs (Voges)
 Honor Society (Linder)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the interventions listed above are known to have a significant impact on teacher efficacy and student achievement.

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.

Collaborative Planning

Person Responsible: Lisa Dubrulle (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: 2nd week of school, Week of 08/21/2023 continuing through end of the school year. (Also held sessions in Holly Hill Learns prior to preplanning).

Holly Hill Learns professional development sessions centered upon the needs of our teachers. These sessions will correlate directly with our professional learning plan. (Sessions already held to include training from State Literacy Coach around Writing). Sessions already scheduled in the near future pertaining to Waterford usage.

Person Responsible: Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Began during preplanning and will continue throughout the school year.

Weekly PLCs

Person Responsible: Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLCs began during preplanning week and will continue weekly unless not permitted due to blackout weeks.

Master Schedule allotted for common planning and PLCs

Person Responsible: Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: July 2023

Thinking Maps

Person Responsible: Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Attending training August - October in a "train the trainer" model and then will bring back to the faculty and staff.

Intervention Support Schedule with highly qualified Teachers.

Person Responsible: Lisa Dubrulle (ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Academic Coach will take the lead on the creation/monitoring/updating of the intervention schedule based on data.

Walk through schedule to ensure classroom visibility. One reporting system for quick classroom visits, and one reporting system to gather data for our four classroom look-fors.

Person Responsible: Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Tracking system developed by 1st week of school. Walks beginning during 2nd week of school.

Weekly Instructional Leadership Meeting

Person Responsible: Robert Voges (rvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly instructional meeting held with Admin, TOAs, and Academic Coaches to begin 2nd week of school.

Friday Admin Meeting

Person Responsible: Robert Voges (rvoges@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly Admin meeting held with Admin team to debrief the week and plan for the week ahead.

Before school, during school, and after school tutoring.

Person Responsible: Melissa Wilson (mcwilso1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Tutoring will begin in the 4th week of school.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

The Federal Percent of Points Index for Black/African American students was 36% and this is the third consecutive year that their score has been below the requisite 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 42% of Black/African American students will score a 70% or higher on the state FAST ELA and Math 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 # of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 coaching support will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and district specialists will walk classrooms and monitor PLCs to ensure that all Black/African American scholars are receiving benchmark aligned instruction at the depth and rigor demanded by the standards. This focus area will be monitored by the instructional leadership team weekly, SLT monthly, and evidenced in the stock take process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Lowery (klowery@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.)

Collaborative Planning (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Holly Hill Learns (Lowrey)
 Weekly PLCs (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Master Schedule allotted for common planning and PLCs (Glanezer)
 Thinking Maps (Lowrey)
 Intervention Support Schedule with highly qualified Teachers (DuBrule)
 Walk Through Schedule (Lowrey)
 Weekly Instructional Leadership Meeting (Voges)
 Friday Admin Meeting (Voges)
 Tutoring (Wilson)
 Academic Clubs (Voges)
 Honor Society (Linder)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the interventions listed above are known to have a significant impact on teacher efficacy and student achievement.

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The Federal Percent of Points Index for our ELL students was 39 %. This is the first year that ELL students have fallen below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 42% of ELL students will score a 70% or higher on the state FAST ELA and Math 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 # of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 coaching support will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and district specialists will walk classrooms and monitor PLCs to ensure that all ELL scholars are receiving benchmark aligned instruction at the depth and rigor demanded by the standards. This focus area will be monitored by the instructional leadership team weekly, SLT monthly, and evidenced in the stock take process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Voges (rvoges@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.)

Collaborative Planning (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Holly Hill Learns (Lowrey)
 Weekly PLCs (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Master Schedule allotted for common planning and PLCs (Glanezer)
 Thinking Maps (Lowrey)
 Intervention Support Schedule with highly qualified Teachers (DuBrule)
 Walk Through Schedule (Lowrey)
 Weekly Instructional Leadership Meeting (Voges)
 Friday Admin Meeting (Voges)
 Tutoring (Wilson)
 Academic Clubs (Voges)
 Honor Society (Linder)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the interventions listed above are known to have a significant impact on teacher efficacy and student achievement.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The Federal Percent of Points Index for our ELL students was 24%. This is the third year that ESE/SWD students have fallen below the 41% threshold and third consecutive year it has been below the 32% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 42% of ESE/SWD students will score a 70% or higher on the state FAST ELA and Math 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 # of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 coaching support will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and district specialists will walk classrooms and monitor PLCs to ensure that all ESE/SWD scholars are receiving benchmark aligned instruction at the depth and rigor demanded by the standards. This focus area will be monitored by the instructional leadership team weekly, SLT monthly, and evidenced in the stock take process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Glaenzer (swglaenz@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.)

Collaborative Planning (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Holly Hill Learns (Lowrey)
 Weekly PLCs (DuBrule, Friedman, Robinson)
 Master Schedule allotted for common planning and PLCs (Glanezer)
 Thinking Maps (Lowrey)
 Intervention Support Schedule with highly qualified Teachers (DuBrule)
 Walk Through Schedule (Lowrey)
 Weekly Instructional Leadership Meeting (Voges)
 Friday Admin Meeting (Voges)
 Tutoring (Wilson)
 Academic Clubs (Voges)
 Honor Society (Linder)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the interventions listed above are known to have a significant impact on teacher efficacy and student achievement.

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).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In our primary grades, students took the STAR literacy assessment 3 times throughout the 22-23 school year. The final data from the PM3 assessment window was as follows: Kindergarten - _____% of students were Tier 3, _____% of students were Tier 2, while _____% of students were Tier 1. When looking at specific strands, _____ 1st grade - _____% of students were Tier 3, _____% of students were Tier 2, while _____% of students were Tier 1. When looking at specific 1st grade strands _____ 2nd grade - _____% of students were Tier 3, _____% of students were Tier 2, while _____% of students were Tier 1. When looking at specific 2nd grade strands _____.

When analyzing the primary grade level data points as a whole, we determined that _____ will be an area of focus during the 2023-2024 school year.

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

In our intermediate grades, students took both the FAST assessment and the iReady Diagnostic Assessment at 3 different points throughout the 22-23 school year. The final data from the PM3 assessment windows for both tests was as follows: 3rd grade - (iReady) 46% of students were proficient

(FAST) 27% of students were proficient. 4th grade - (iReady) 22% of students were proficient (FAST) 26% of students were proficient. 5th grade - (iReady) 29% of students were proficient (FAST) 28% of students were proficient.

In reviewing the grade level data, we determined that Tier 1 instruction is a major concern. As a result of the proficiency areas in grades 3, 4, and 5 being significantly below the desired threshold, it was determined that Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA will be an Area of Focus during the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Walkthroughs by leadership will result in 70% of teachers demonstrating successful implementation of the district wide look-fors by December 2023. We will increase the % of teachers with successful implementation to 90% by May of 2024.

As students take the STAR Literacy assessment throughout the school year, we will see increases in proficiency from one progress monitoring to the next. By May 2023, at least 50% of our K-2 students will achieve proficiency on the PM3 assessment. The goal is for each of the three primary grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency in the 23-24 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Walkthroughs by leadership will result in 70% of teachers demonstrating successful implementation of the district wide look-fors by December 2023. We will increase the % of teachers with successful implementation to 90% by May of 2024.

By May of 2024, we will see 42% of students in grades 3-5 earn proficiency on the FAST PM3 Assessment. In comparison to the 22-23 school year, this would be an increase of 15% for 3rd grade, 16% for 4th grade, and 14% for 5th grade. The goal is for each of the three intermediate grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency in the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This Area of Focus will be monitored using multiple systems. Our Admin Team will be completing weekly schoolwide instructional walks (K-8), with each member observing a different content area each week. The goal of the weekly walks is to maintain classroom visibility. On a bi-weekly basis, the Admin team will be completing instructional walk throughs using our district wide look-for tool to collect evidence. PLC

data chats and collaborative planning sessions will occur to determine instructional adjustments needed as a result of the walks and recent student achievement data. Coaching caseloads and cycles will occur based on the Tiering of teachers completed in Week 2 of the school year, and again in January when returning from the Holiday break.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dubrulle, Lisa, ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our evidence-based strategy is to utilize collaborative planning tools to cultivate benchmark-aligned Tier 1 instruction. Differentiation and acceleration (Tier 2/Tier 3 intervention) will occur based on formative and summative achievement data obtained regularly and will be planned during PLCs and Collaborative planning sessions.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

According to the research of John Hattie, the following strategies have a significant effect size or potential for considerably increasing/accelerating student achievement: planning and prediction (.76), clear goal intentions (.48), Response to Intervention (1.29).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literacy Leadership: benchmark-aligned instruction will be used to promote a culture of literacy and will be monitored to ensure all students are exposed to appropriate grade level tasks. - Literacy Coaching: ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on understanding newly implemented benchmarks. The ELA Coach will provide support with delivery of instruction, lesson modeling, and planning in collaborative planning. The ELA Coach will also support teachers with the intentional inclusion of Thinking Maps in their planning for instruction. - Assessment: Use of collaborative planning structures will help teachers assess their understanding of benchmarks and reflect on benchmark aligned instruction. The inclusion of Thinking Maps will help teachers plan for student understanding of the benchmarks and work as a means to enhance student thinking. - Professional Learning: a team of teachers and administrators have committed to the implementation of Thinking Maps at Holly Hill School. After attending the initial training, the team will establish a roll-out plan for implementation. We will use Thinking Maps to enhance the thinking occurring in classrooms K-8, with the goal of positively impacting student achievement specifically in ELA. 	<p>Lowrey, Katie, ktlowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literacy Leadership: (Data Analysis): monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and Monthly School Leadership Team Meeting. Academic Coach, Regional Resource Teacher, and Administration will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will occur through progress monitoring. Instructional decisions will be made to increase student achievement. - Literacy Coaching: ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers that is focused on identifying leveled groups based on benchmarks not mastered. In addition, Intervention teacher will work with Tier 2 and 3 students to remediate areas of focus. - Assessment: Unit Assessments will be administered after each unit. Assessment results will be progress monitored by Administration. - Professional Learning: Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during ERPLs on the MTSS process to learn structures and strategies to improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and student achievement. 	<p>Dubrule, Lisa, ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literacy Leadership: Instructional Learning Walks will help ensure benchmarks and tasks are aligned. Administration will participate in walks with alongside district representatives, Administration will walk with Coaches, and Teachers will also participate in peer learning walks with the goal of increasing professional practice. Feedback regarding sense of urgency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and task alignment will be shared with teachers. - Literacy Coaching: School Leadership/District Specialists will provide coaching and feedback to teachers focused on school-wide lookfors: frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks. Teachers will engage in coaching cycles, and feedback will be provided by the ELA Coach as well. - Assessment: - Professional Learning: Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during PLCs and Collaborative Planning focused on Differentiated Instruction and how to strategically group students based on skills/benchmarks not mastered to target our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. 	<p>Dubrule, Lisa, ladubrul@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>

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.

In addition to our active social media accounts and posting on our webpage, families and stakeholders will have access to our SIP and SWP through our Annual Open House and the 6 family events delineated below. In addition, our SIP Chair reports to the SAC at their monthly meetings.

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))

Holly Hill School will host a series of events on campus to increase community and parental involvement in our school. The first event was a barbecue that brought over 500 community members to our campus to learn about our mission and vision. We have already had community members commit to next year and the event will expand to include additional services, like dental and haircuts, for our scholars.

In addition to this premier event, on October 28th, we will host our first family fitness week culminating in the Grace Weite Memorial 5K Fun Run & Lemonade Parade! Hundreds of runners and community members will converge on our campus for a run through our city and learning about the science of nutrition and health.

In January we will host Florida Arbor Day on campus as we "dig deeper" into the standards while planting trees and learning about nature. And our final Saturday family event will be in April - STEM Saturday at the hill with rockets and all!

In addition, we hosted Kindergarten Signing Night for our new families and will host a Literacy Knight and Math March Madness Knight. We are also developing a partnership to have Saturday School for adults and families.

Principal Voges has already engaged with the Holly Hill Chamber of Commerce and Greater Daytona Chamber of Commerce and will be presenting to the education committees of both organizations this fall.

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)

We are focused on bell-to-bell learning and on-time attendance for both students and teachers. In addition we will be offering after school tutoring, academic clubs before, during, and after school. We are focusing on school-wide reading and will be doing "One Book. One City." in Holly Hill this year. We have also turned our families on to New Worlds Reading and are working close with the Early Learning Coalition and Head Start to support our youngest scholars.

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))

We are working closely with the Early Learning Coalition, Head Start, and the City of Holly Hill to complete our mission. We have also collaborated with School Way Cafe and they will be at our family events supporting nutrition and healthy eating. The Holly Hill Kiwanis Club is going to partner with us to do Reading Buddies and will be funding an early literacy project. Our local Garden Club has funded and is working with our Head Start / VPK teams to teach scholars about nature and maintain a butterfly garden in their atrium. IN addition they have begun a tree garden to provide shade for our PE fields and teach students about the importance of trees.

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: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

Yes