

Volusia County Schools

Ormond Beach Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Ormond Beach Middle School

151 DOMICILIO AVE, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

To close the opportunity gap through challenging and engaging thinking to prepare all students for college and career readiness in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"The Legacy of Excellence Continues..."

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
Iannarelli, Heather	Principal	Principal Iannarelli provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making by encouraging the use of School City to differentiate instruction in the classroom. She ensures that educators are implementing the Florida Standards and BEST Standards, which are accessible through the K-12 curriculum link of our webpage. For students who do not respond positively to classroom interventions, she ensures that students receive remediation through the MTSS process. She also encourages struggling students to be referred to our Problem Solving Team (PST) as needed. She ensures that adequate professional development is scheduled for faculty and staff. As principal, she supports the school's team in the completion of resource mapping (academics and behavioral) with a focus on differentiation, student engagement, and teacher clarity. Mrs. Iannarelli communicates with all stakeholders through newsletters, School Messenger, relevant meetings, OBMS TV, and social media in order to address educating ALL students, meeting student needs, and sharing pertinent information.
Ciulla, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Ciulla is the OBMS 8th grade administrator. She ensures that our 8th grade general education teachers provide quality instruction to our students and participate in data collection and discussions. She is responsible for creating our master schedule, reviewing our performance data to schedule our students, and collaborating with teachers and counselors to ensure that all students are properly placed in courses. Additionally, she assist in our testing coordinator, overseeing all aspects for the administration of standardized tests
Fatta, Tara	School Counselor	Tara Fatta is one of Ormond Beach Middle School's Counselors. She assists and advises students about academic and personal decisions, she provides private counseling to students, assesses the ability and potential in students, and coordinates with fellow professionals on student matters. She helps develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; she identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; she identifies systematic patterns of students' needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence based intervention
Henry, Derrick	Assistant Principal	Mr. Henry is the OBMS 7th grade administrator. He ensures that our 7th grade general education teachers provide quality instruction to our students and participate in data collection and discussions. Additionally, he is in charge of our safety and security procedures. He helps develop safety policies and procedures, organizes a security team, holds security meetings, solves safety issues, coordinates safety audits, and tracks corrective actions and incident data.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Parris, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	
Pirkey, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Kristen Pirkey is Ormond Beach Middle School's Math PLC Chair. She helps develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; she identifies and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; she identifies systematic patterns of students' needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; she assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at-risk"; she assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; she participates in the design and delivery of professional development; she provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; she disseminates information to her department
King, Caryn	Teacher, K-12	Caryn King is Ormond Beach Middle School's ELA PLC Chair. She helps develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; she identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; she identifies systematic patterns of students' needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; she assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at-risk"; she assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; she participates in the design and delivery of professional development; she provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; she disseminates information to her department.
KELLEHER, SUSAN	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kelleher is the OBMS Student Services administrator. She drives the programs and services provided for Exceptional Student Education (ESE). She ensures that ESE teachers and case managers participate in student data collection and discussions. Through classroom visitations, she guarantees that teachers integrate research-based instructional activities and materials into their lessons. She makes certain that all teachers understand and implement the inclusion and collaborative practice models and that all teachers are complying with and providing the necessary accommodations as required by the IEP, BIP, and/or 504 Plan. She coordinates the gifted, 504, PST, and community-based mental health services for our school.
Ryan, Heather	Instructional Coach	Heather Ryan is Ormond Beach Middle School's Instructional Coach. She works as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning. She is focused on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding about research-based effective instruction; She helps

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; she identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches; she identifies systematic patterns of students' needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; she assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at-risk"; she assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; she participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and she provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	50	69	75	194	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	72	82	178	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	70	13	94	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	12	28	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	98	83	229	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	53	69	157	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	69	32	123	

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	42	77	88	207

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

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

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	84	75	93	252	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	121	78	280	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	9	61	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	20	59	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	92	93	245	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	95	89	264	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	41	47	113	

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	82	104	95	281

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	75	93	252	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	121	78	280	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	9	52	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	20	59	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	92	93	245	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	95	89	264	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	41	47	113	

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	82	104	95	281

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	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*	54	44	49	54	45	50	56		
ELA Learning Gains				44			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			34		
Math Achievement*	60	48	56	61	31	36	58		
Math Learning Gains				53			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			25		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	49	49	63	46	53	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	67	68	74	49	58	76		
Middle School Acceleration	65	62	73	73	43	49	75		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress		31	40		69	76	70		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	26	Yes	4	2
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	41			
HSP	53			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	50			

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	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	52			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	54			60			59	67	65			
SWD	20			24			23	28	36		5	
ELL	36			64							2	
AMI												
ASN	78			89							2	
BLK	30			32			34	48	60		5	
HSP	47			61			25	80			4	
MUL	52			53			57	58	64		5	
PAC												
WHT	58			64			65	71	64		5	
FRL	45			47			47	57	52		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	44	32	61	53	40	63	74	73			
SWD	10	24	23	16	34	30	11	40				
ELL	48	43		57	70			64				
AMI												
ASN	85	71		90	81		100		100			
BLK	28	41	37	26	40	26	27	47				
HSP	50	44	17	55	53	50	61	60	82			
MUL	43	29	29	50	49	33	46	71	70			
PAC												
WHT	59	45	32	67	54	46	68	79	72			
FRL	42	37	27	49	50	39	56	64	63			

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	56	50	34	58	44	25	59	76	75			70
SWD	20	31	27	12	21	22	23	27				
ELL	46	57	45	33	26	20						70

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	88	71		88	38			100	100			
BLK	24	30	19	21	27	19	15	46				
HSP	55	53	57	46	36	17	50	86	82			
MUL	43	38	30	43	38	27	25	58				
PAC												
WHT	60	52	39	63	49	28	66	79	74			
FRL	44	44	33	45	38	24	47	69	67			

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	53%	44%	9%	47%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	39%	10%	47%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	42%	10%	47%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	49%	10%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	48%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	37%	17%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	44%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	32%	55%	50%	37%

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 students' performance in ELA has continued to decline for the past three years. Last year, this decline can be attributed to ELA teacher vacancies at the 8th-grade level. Our students did not have a certified ELA teacher in 8th grade for three-fourths of the school year. This means that our students did not receive the benchmark-aligned instruction that a certified ELA teacher could have provided. John Hattie attributes a .60 effect size to direct instruction in the classroom. Therefore, the loss of a certified instructor in ELA was a significant factor affecting test scores.

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

Our greatest decline in student performance occurred in Civics. This can also be attributed to losing a certified teacher midyear. While we were able to hire a new teacher in March, our students lost 3 months of benchmark-aligned instruction in Civics. Again, Hattie shows an effect size of .60 for direct instruction. Therefore, the loss of a certified instructor in Civics was a significant factor affecting test scores.

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.

OBMS was not below the state in any component.

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

8th grade math

Teacher consistency/engagement strategies

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

Attendance and Discipline

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

ELA

Civics

SWD

Science

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.

Needs assessment and analysis, revealed that only 53% of our students reached proficiency in ELA and 58% in Science. Social Studies was 67%. With an increased focus on benchmark-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 70% of our students in 6th-8th grade will be able to score a 70% or higher on our science, Civics, math and ELA district benchmark aligned assessments. By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students standards-aligned instruction as evidenced in walkthroughs; By May 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%

Monitoring:

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

The school academic coach will be present in collaborative planning to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned to the benchmarks. The 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. Finally, the school administration will attend PLC meetings and engage in the deliberate planning process with the teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@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.)

Grades 6-8 core subject areas will be utilizing VCS curriculum maps and designated resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention data was chosen based on state and district benchmark aligned assessments. The resources that the district has provided have been vetted to ensure that they are aligned to the benchmark.

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.

- School Based Leadership Teams will create a collaboration walk calendar.

Person Responsible: Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 31st, 2023

- Data analysis of monthly assessments and progress monitoring data for student growth

Person Responsible: Melissa Ciulla (mjiulla@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Heather Ryan (hryan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Heather Ryan (hryan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#2. 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 area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1. Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our student with disabilities have the greatest need for improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase proficiency of students with disabilities in all subject areas by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity checks of the interventions that were selected to ensure the fidelity and integrity of implementation to increase LG of SWD and BLK subgroups. Two times per month PLC's will engage in data analysis of LQ and ESSA subgroup students to determine the effect of the intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC. The instrument for data collection will be Achieve 3000 Lexile scores and FAST progress monitoring data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SUSAN KELLEHER (skelleh@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 strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports. Tier1 and Tier 2 reading will implement Achieve 3000 which is a program that provides differentiated instructional content that targets individual students' area of need. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during small group rotations and student self monitoring and accountability of Achieve 3000 Lexile scores. ELA will utilize resources from the district's curriculum map and pacing guide to differentiate instruction and provide Tier 1 foundational instructional practices aligned to the ELA B.E.S.T. standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS is not a "wait to fail" model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29. When implemented with fidelity. Source: Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005; Dexter, Hughes, & Farmer, 2008; Simmons, Coyne, Kwok, McDonagh, Ham & Kame'enui, 2008; Hattie, 2015.

Schools will be provided with essential training in MTSS and its strategies to support student learning

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review student FSA data to determine the need for Tier 2 & Tier 3 reading intervention from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups based on by-weekly data review and determine how to meet the needs of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 who are not responding to the interventions based on the Decision Rules and ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

Person Responsible: Heather Ryan (hryan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: By fourth quarter

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS systems and structures.

Decision Rules Guidance ICEL - Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner

Person Responsible: SUSAN KELLEHER (slkelleh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: fourth quarter

Implementation of PL of MTSS strategies following the District ERPLs through PLC's Decision Rules guidance and ICEL Strategy; Tier 1 – 100% of students should receive Tier 1 and at least 80% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. Tier 2 – 15% of students receive targeted level of prevention; Tier 3 – 3-5% of students receive intensive level of prevention

Person Responsible: Heather Ryan (hryan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: fourth quarter

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. After conducting our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it was discovered that our students had a total of 1882 discipline events that resulted in 501 suspensions. This results in time out of the classroom and lost instruction. Further analysis also revealed disproportionate discipline of minority students and students with disabilities. Data shows 18% of our population received 30% of referrals which consist of ESSA subgroups - SWD, AA and Multi-racial. Many of our students receiving the discipline referrals are also in our lower quartiles of Math and ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to decrease student referrals that result in OSS by 10%

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through PBIS data chats based on referrals, PASS, suspension, disproportionate rates of discipline and academic achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sierra Holcombe (smholcom@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 strategy will be Positive Behavior Intervention and Support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive Behavior Intervention & Support offer the promise to transform teacher-student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. According to John Hattie, behavioral intervention programs have an effect size of .62 and teacher-student relationships have an affect size of .48. Those will be in conjunction with the use of collective teacher efficacy, with an effect size of 1.57, to ensure consistency amongst behavioral expectations. Therefore, this should also show a larger than average impact on learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures.

Person Responsible: Heather Iannarelli (hmiannar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: First quarter

Create and train school based PBIS team to implement school wide behavior expectations and train faculty

Person Responsible: Sierra Holcombe (smholcom@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: First quarter

PBIS expectations will be posted in all classrooms and high frequency areas so students will be reminded daily of the expectations. PBIS School expectations lesson will be implemented in 1st period classes and on OBMS school news

Person Responsible: Sierra Holcombe (smholcom@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 31st

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data

Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

Person Responsible: Sierra Holcombe (smholcom@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: On Going

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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**

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$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