

Volusia County Schools

River Springs Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/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 River Springs Middle School, all students will move forward career and college ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

River Springs Middle School will provide an inclusive school community committed to academic excellence.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vaughan, Thomas	Principal	
Fratu, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
Ezell, Candace	Assistant Principal	
Smith, William	Assistant Principal	
Marchione, Lauren	Instructional Coach	
Crane, Katherine	SAC Member	
Baker, Kristine	Teacher, K-12	
Hurtado, Jose	Teacher, K-12	
Parker, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Gifford, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	
Smithers, Heidi	Teacher, ESE	
Whited, Brandon	Dean	

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.

SAC is represented on the School Leadership Team. The School Leadership Team and School Advisory Council will review the SIP; SAC will determine how to best disseminate the plan to stakeholders. SAC input will be recorded during the school year to incorporate in the next year's SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored by both the School Leadership Team and the School Advisory Council.

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	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	89%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: 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	95	108	99	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	92	113	254
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	20	30	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	21	59
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	163	154	426
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	127	113	335
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	22	60

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	83	121	120	324

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	12	24	35	71
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	20	40

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	97	108	132	337
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	76	100	274
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	43	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	30	12	123
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	134	158	408
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	124	172	423
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	30	52	125

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	129	108	127	364

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	18	6	7	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	16

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	97	108	132	337
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	76	100	274
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	43	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	30	12	123
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	134	158	408
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	124	172	423
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	30	52	125

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	129	108	127	364

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	18	6	7	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	16

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*	43	44	49	48	45	50	47		
ELA Learning Gains				45			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			30		
Math Achievement*	50	48	56	45	31	36	46		
Math Learning Gains				46			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			30		
Science Achievement*	50	49	49	50	46	53	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	67	68	69	49	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	53	62	73	68	43	49	71		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress	17	31	40	44	69	76	53		

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
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	22	Yes	4	4
ELL	25	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	44			
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	59			
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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	45			

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	43			50			50	76	53			17
SWD	18			27			15	53	6		6	13
ELL	17			35			24	41	18		6	17
AMI												
ASN	64			68							2	
BLK	34			43			33	66	44		5	
HSP	35			43			41	66	35		6	21
MUL	51			56			50	68	70		5	
PAC												
WHT	45			53			57	81	58		5	
FRL	32			43			41	69	42		6	14

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	48	45	36	45	46	45	50	69	68			44
SWD	17	35	35	17	35	36	28	31	36			27
ELL	28	43	36	23	37	38	32	38	53			44
AMI												
ASN	58	68		58	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
BLK	35	41	36	27	38	31	29	69	50			
HSP	41	41	42	36	44	57	37	65	63			43
MUL	62	39		41	38		60	67	62			
PAC												
WHT	51	47	34	51	47	46	57	72	70			
FRL	41	43	35	38	44	41	41	63	63			44

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	47	45	30	46	34	30	52	62	71			53
SWD	17	34	34	21	31	30	11	39	56			37
ELL	22	36	32	20	28	30	12	49	53			53
AMI												
ASN	33	40		50	62				91			
BLK	29	35	29	29	30	29	27	50	63			
HSP	36	47	38	36	34	28	29	50	57			55
MUL	56	39		43	33			62	73			
PAC												
WHT	53	46	29	52	34	30	61	68	73			
FRL	39	42	31	39	34	29	40	54	67			52

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	41%	44%	-3%	47%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	39%	1%	47%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	42%	-5%	47%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	49%	-1%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	48%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	55%	37%	18%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	44%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	32%	29%	50%	11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	39%	44%	48%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	65%	9%	66%	8%

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.

ELA was 40% proficient. ESSA (ESE, ELL, Black); new teachers to content area; lowest performing class had no teacher for half of the year; new benchmarks and curriculum (high school standards are middle school standards, students don't have needed background knowledge).

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

ELA Proficiency dropped from 48% to 40%. Aligning instruction to the rigor of the benchmarks in addition to staffing vacancies and novice teachers.

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.

6th grade ELA has the greatest gap (36% proficiency; state 47%);

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

8th grade Math showed the greatest improvement. RSMS enlisted weekly support from district specialists and hired veteran teachers in math content areas.

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

Suspensions and Level 1 students (both ELA and Math).

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Collaborative Planning
3. Proficiency level of ESSA subgroups
4. Decrease discipline occurrences
5. Attendance

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 Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our Needs Assessment identified ELA proficiency as our greatest area of need (40% proficiency). Our Instructional Review Action Plan Learning Walk data from 2023 revealed that classroom tasks were not always aligned to the benchmark. It also revealed a need for engagement activities to increase student collaboration. Collaborative planning in all subject areas with intentional focus on aligning lessons and activities to benchmarks will address this need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Practice: After administration of PM1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with state growth trends.

Teacher Practice: By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers in all subject areas will provide student standards-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice: By April 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.

Administration will review PLC meeting notes weekly to provide support and feedback to teachers as they are planning their instruction. Instructional Coach and administrators will be present in collaborative planning to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned. School leadership team will conduct walk-throughs to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning. Leadership team will meet monthly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Vaughan (twvaughan@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.)

Achieve 3000 will be used to support students scoring in the lowest quartile for ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Achieve 3000 allows us to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Data from Achieve 3000 will be utilized primarily by ELA teachers when developing interventions and remediation following collaborative planning between the intensive reading teachers and core teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide professional learning on the four look-fors.

1. Teacher provides explicit instruction aligned to the grade-level benchmark and intended learning.
2. Teacher provides tasks aligned to the grade-level benchmark and intended learning.
3. Teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the benchmark and intended learning.
4. Teacher provides students with opportunities to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Pre-planning introduction; ongoing through faculty meetings.

Utilize collaborative planning form focusing on look-fors.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLC meetings beginning week of 8/28/23.

Administration will create a walkthrough calendar and include time for collaboration and analysis of observable data.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/18/23

Administration and coach will conduct walkthroughs and coaching based on look-fors.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

A review of our data suggested a need to utilize our Early Warning System to increase the monitoring of students with attendance and discipline indicators.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Attendance: Increase average daily attendance to 85%. Average daily attendance for the 22-23 school year was 82%.

Discipline: Reduce referrals by 25% to return to school year 2021-22 numbers; RSMS had 5,107 referrals during the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Administration reviews EWS reports weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@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 Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a multi-tiered system of support for providing Tier 1-3 behavioral interventions. Research shows positive improvement in behavior when implemented with fidelity.

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 for administration and counselors on how to access the EWS.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Introduced 8/25, ongoing weekly meetings

EWS data will be shared with teachers to use in team discussions on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

School Leadership Team will monitor EWS monthly.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Teams and PST chairs will utilize EWS in the MTSS process.

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

SLT meets monthly to review PBIS Tier 1 implementation

Person Responsible: Thomas Vaughan (twvaugha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly