Seabreeze High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Seabreeze High School

2700 N OLEANDER AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

http://seabreezehigh.org/

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.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"In a caring, cooperative environment, the Seabreeze Family strives to provide opportunities for everyone to realize individual potential, to encourage ethical behavior, and to develop skills for lifelong success."

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
Harris, Tucker	Principal	
LaGrotta, Stinamay	Assistant Principal	Data and Scheduling
Picott, Tikija	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction
Presley, Dhand	Assistant Principal	ESE Instruction and Compliance
Rudolph, Carolyn	Instructional Coach	Math Instruction
Payne, Tamara	Instructional Coach	ELA instruction
Lewitt, Jodi	Assistant Principal	Discipline and Attendance
Goldstone, Aaron	Dean	Discipline and Safety
Gibbens, Debbie	Other	MTSS implementation and Tracking

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.

Mr. Harris, Principal, will be our key communicator using phone messaging to parents, morning announcements to students, and emails to our faculty and staff. Promoting a positive school culture by continuing to react to the requests of more communication, he will address these stakeholders weekly with updates and information.

Brad Montgomery, athletic director, will be our athletics liaison as he plans sporting recognition events for alumni and organizations supporting our school as well as various booster organizations. Our activities director will direct graduation and senior events along with senior class sponsors (teachers).

Mrs. Picott will monitor and create social media blasts using Twitter, InstaGram and FaceBook to disseminate information, relay timelines/deadlines, and promote school events and academic achievements.

Our guidance director, Mrs. Les, will continue to promote scholarship opportunities and academic opportunities. In addition college visits, dual enrollment, and other college/career related information will be relayed by this department.

Our CTE facilitator (Mrs. Smurdon) will monitor academy success and enrollment and review our college and career readiness via acceleration points earned by our students.

Lastly, AVID and AICE will continue to be a integral part of our school culture providing students with opportunities within their programs. Our AVID Site Plan will be supported by our AVID Facilitator. The AICE Facilitator, Mrs. Gaines will continue to be primary stakeholders in our culture and environment within their programs supporting school-wide initiatives.

The information disseminated from the communications with all stakeholders was used to determine our school focus and action steps. We also share the SIP with the SAC committee and encourage teachers to ask them for support in reaching classroom goals based upon the 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))

Leadership team will meet throughout the year to compare data and track progress towards the goals and action steps in the SIP. Coaches and admin will meet weekly to review classroom trends and evidence of "look fors" that they see in core classrooms. CTE coach will meet with administration on a regular basis to also share data and evidence of "look fors" in CTE classrooms. AICE coordinator will meet and relay similar information.

Within these meetings, there will be a focused look at the scores of our underachieving students to monitor growth and needs assessments will be done as needed throughout the year. Especially for the students enrolled in foundational math and intensive reading.

Mid- year the team will reconvene with all collected data and determine the efficacy of our SIP and make decisions as it relates to meeting our action step goals.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	73%
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: 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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	419
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	345
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	0	0	0	340

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	0	0	65
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	50	51	46	51	58		
ELA Learning Gains				46			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			35		
Math Achievement*	38	28	38	32	33	38	32		
Math Learning Gains				42			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			15		
Science Achievement*	77	68	64	66	30	40	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	59	66	61	40	48	62		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	92	90	89	92	65	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	70	65	65	67	62	67	49		
ELP Progress	20	44	45	46			62		

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	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

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	578
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

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	41			
ELL	11	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	46			
HSP	60			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	60			

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	1
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	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%
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	57			
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			38			77	75		92	70	20
SWD	26			13			44	51		26	6	
ELL	12			0							3	20
AMI												
ASN	86						92			80	4	
BLK	22			20			43	62		38	6	
HSP	49			39			71	78		65	7	25
MUL	41			43			83			71	5	
PAC												
WHT	60			41			82	76		73	6	
FRL	43			31			67	70		60	6	

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	51	46	28	32	42	47	66	61		92	67	46
SWD	21	28	20	13	39	41	18	28		79	15	
ELL		40		0	36							46
AMI												
ASN	70	50					93			100	75	

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	19	25	14	9	35	41	34	33		82	41	
HSP	38	50	33	28	40	45	65	47		89	71	40
MUL	38	44		28	41		47	50				
PAC												
WHT	56	49	32	37	43	51	70	65		94	69	
FRL	38	41	29	23	39	42	57	52		86	56	50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	58	54	35	32	20	15	64	62		90	49	62
SWD	20	39	36	12	19	14	24	26		84	7	
ELL	45	60		23						100	46	62
AMI												
ASN	76	65		30			70					
BLK	20	23	20	9	12	11	33	44		83	15	
HSP	45	53		21	10			46	56		96	44	
MUL	50	57		29	33		55			71	20	
PAC												
WHT	62	56	37	37	21	18	70	66		90	54	
FRL	41	44	35	20	15	14	52	53		84	40	

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
10	2023 - Spring	57%	45%	12%	50%	7%
09	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	48%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	32%	-7%	50%	-25%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	39%	10%	48%	1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	63%	12%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	57%	16%	63%	10%

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.

The data component showing the lowest performance was ELA lowest quartile with 28% proficiency. The factors contributing were absence of academic coaching, Lack of PLC planning, and class sizes were above recommended sizes due to inconsistent staffing for the number of students enrolled.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from 20-21 to 21-22 school years was ELA learning gains moving from 54% to 46%. The factors contributing to this decline were absence of academic coaching, Lack of PLC planning, and class sizes were above recommended sizes due to inconsistent staffing for the number of students enrolled.

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.

According to 21-22 data, the component with the greatest gap when compared to the state was Math achievement. Seabreeze math achievement was 32% compared to the state average of 46%. The factors that contributed to this gap were a lack of staff to teach algebra and geometry, class sizes exceeding recommended class sizes, there were three teachers hired within the year creating an inconsistency in our classrooms, and lack of support provided by a math coach.

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

The component for 21-22 school year that showed the most improvement was math lowest quartile moving from 15% to 47%. The new actions taken by our school were strategically placing students in a back- to- back schedule pairing foundational math skills with algebra 1 and geometry.

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

Potential areas of concern are attendance and suspensions. from 2022-2023 ninth and tenth- grade students that were not attending at least 90% of the school days were 22% the entire school is 24%. The percentage of students in ninth and tenth- grade who experienced a suspension is 18% and for the entire student body 13%.

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

1. Overall ELA achievement
2. Overall Math achievement
3. ESSA subgroups below 41% proficient (SWD- 30%, ELL-31%, and BLK-33%)
4. Attendance and suspensions from EWS
5. Lowest Quartile achievement and learning gains in math and ELA

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

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

24% of students are not attending school consistently (at least 90% of the time). 13% of students were suspended last school year. This shows a need to improve upon the positive culture and student morale on campus.

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

By February 2024, attendance should increase and bring our percentage of students not consistently attending (90% of the time) to below 10% we should also see a decrease in suspensions at this time to also under 10%.

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

The PBIS team will meet monthly to implement and support the school's PBIS plan. Through active communication with staff and students, the morale and engagement will improve. Discipline and attendance data will be monitored through the discipline office and shared with faculty and staff quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jodi Lewitt (jslewitt@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.)

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

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

21-22 school year data shows achievement levels in ELA and Math that are 51% for ELA and 32% for Math. Decrease in learning gains in ELA from 54-36% also shows a need to focus on instructional practices and professional development based in best practices based in teacher clarity and the look- for indicators from both the district and school.

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

By the end of the 2023- 2024 school year, ELA and Math will reach 62% proficiency in achievement. In the lowest quartile, 62% of students will achieve learning gains.

By the end of the year, all teachers should be teaching on standard with the level of rigor appropriate for the students in their class.

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

Instructional coaches and VSET evaluators will monitor student expectations and teacher fidelity to best practices through aggressive monitoring using look- fors and provide feedback using a feedback form and coaching strategies based upon data monitoring in PLC groups. Leadership team will meet to calibrate feedback and make changes to monitoring tool as needed on a monthly basis.

All teachers will be monitored using a weekly look- for sheet to provide targeted feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tikija Picott (tdpicott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence- based intervention for this action step includes collaboration and professional development based in best practices and collaborative structures with meaningful feedback to students using WICOR strategies.
Teacher clarity, gradual release, aggressive monitoring, and look- fors will be utilized in teacher professional development, planning and PLCs.

Our instructional practice focus will be centered around five indicators, four of which are district- driven. Adding one to verify student learning through School- based ERPLS focusing on the indicators and led by Tamara Payne and Carolyn Rudolph with Administrative Staff.

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

As teachers improve their instructional practices and increase rigor to meet the demands of the standards in ELA and Math, students will increase in achieving mastery of the skills necessary to meet proficiency in their respective subject areas. WICOR strategies are proven to improve engagement and collaboration with a focus on critical thinking to improve 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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

In three areas of ESSA groups for Seabreeze, we are below 41% proficiency: SWD at 30%, ELL at 31% and BLK at 33% proficiency.

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

By the end of the 2023- 2024 school year, these ESSA groups (SWD, ELL, and BLK) will achieve 42% proficiency

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

Instructional coaches and administrative team will monitor data throughout the school year to support or improve upon this action step.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stinamay LaGrotta (salagrot@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.)

Teacher clarity, gradual release, aggressive monitoring, and look- fors will be utilized in teacher professional development, planning and PLCs.

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

Students in the ESSA groups need to be held to the same standard as all other students. Teachers should plan to scaffold to meet their needs and expose these students to grade- level texts and demands of standard in Math and ELA.

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).

Agendas are prepared monthly that reflect teacher and school requests to utilize SAC funds to meet individualized goals that support the goal of the SIP.

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

na

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

na

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

na

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

na

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.

.

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?

.

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?

.

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

.

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.

.

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))

.

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))

.

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))

.

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))

.

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))

.

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).

.

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))

.

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))

.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$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