Silver Sands Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/silversandsmiddle/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.

Silver Sands is committed to building individual character and achievement by linking learning to life through real world applications.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Silver Sands Middle School follows the vision statement of Volusia County Schools. Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Inge, Rick	Principal	Oversee SIP process. Conduit between school and community. Lead data analysis conversations.
Leathead, Todd	Assistant Principal	Assist in data analysis. Participate in writing of SIP and monitoring SAC meeting compliance. Facilitating StockTake discussions for mathematics.
Edgell, Kelli	Assistant Principal	ESE Administrator monitoring the progress of students with disabilities.
Mitchell, LaTonya	Assistant Principal	Administrator lead for ELA department. Facilitating StockTake discussion for ELA.
Carlisle, Travis	Math Coach	Works with math department for standards aligned instruction, data analysis, etc.
Circelli , Cindy	Reading Coach	Works with ELA department for standards aligned instruction, data analysis, etc.
Boss, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair for ELA department.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team attended the district SIP preparation day to start the process and worked together throughout the completion of the 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 monitored throughout the school year through PLC and SLT data meetings as well as the midyear review.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	101	119	320
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	106	92	239
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	28	28	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	27	57
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	107	106	299
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	94	107	267
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	103	119	290

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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	101	109	134	344
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	104	112	306
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	31	32	82
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	14	47	85
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	115	158	368
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	123	136	375
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	66	93	226

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	108	118	149	375

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	11	11	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	7

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	101	109	134	344
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	104	112	306
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	31	32	82
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	14	47	85
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	115	158	368
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	123	136	375
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	66	93	226

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	108	118	149	375

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	11	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	7

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*	50	44	49	52	45	50	54		
ELA Learning Gains				43			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			28		
Math Achievement*	50	48	56	55	31	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				52			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			31		
Science Achievement*	59	49	49	60	46	53	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	67	68	77	49	58	67		
Middle School Acceleration	67	62	73	78	43	49	79		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress		31	40	33	69	76	48		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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%
FRL	51			

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	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	42			
HSP	49			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	49			

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	50			50			59	70	67			
SWD	26			20			31	47	30		5	
ELL	25			44			21	83			4	
AMI												
ASN	74			85			71	100	88		5	
BLK	32			29			28	50	48		5	
HSP	41			39			44	67	73		5	
MUL	44			56			68	61	71		5	

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
PAC												
WHT	55			55			67	75	66		5	
FRL	41			40			50	64	58		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	52	43	36	55	52	41	60	77	78			33
SWD	17	31	33	23	37	29	27	46	40			
ELL	32	39	48	37	48	39	22	50				33
AMI												
ASN	70	53		86	82		73	71	95			
BLK	28	38	36	31	46	42	40	48	73			
HSP	46	40	35	45	43	29	52	58	94			50
MUL	60	37	40	54	50		71	82	63			
PAC												
WHT	58	45	36	61	54	43	65	86	77			
FRL	45	42	36	47	50	38	54	70	74			33

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	54	48	28	50	43	31	62	67	79			48
SWD	18	27	18	19	31	32	27	43	17			
ELL	35	46	32	28	24	18		45	73			48
AMI												
ASN	74	70		66	48			77	86			
BLK	31	37	22	22	25	18	35	48	64			
HSP	46	45	24	39	38	25	50	56	75			31
MUL	54	59		50	38		53	75	83			
PAC												
WHT	58	49	31	56	47	38	67	72	80			
FRL	46	42	24	42	38	30	56	58	72			44

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	54%	44%	10%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	39%	3%	47%	-5%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	42%	3%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	49%	2%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	48%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	37%	-10%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	44%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	32%	49%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	39%	59%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	65%	4%	66%	3%

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 SWD ESSA Subgroup in all grade levels continue to be below 41% since 2019 and were below 32% (31%) according to the 2022 data. The contributing factors to this low performance include the high transient rate of this student population, the continued effects of the COVID slide, and the change from FSA to FAST in 2023.

FAST ELA scores decreased schoolwide in 2023 (50%) as compared the the FSA ELA scores from 2022 (52%). The major contributing factor to this decline is the change in the state assessment instrument (FAST). Other contributing factors including staffing issues, the continued effects of the COVID slide, and school closures due to natural disasters.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline in 2023 (68%) from the prior year (2022) are the acceleration points. The factor that contributed to this decline is the state's change in the formula used for calculating acceleration.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average were the follow:
6th grade math FAST (PM3) was 3 percentage points below the state average. This was due to staffing issues in the math department. A 6th grade math teacher was lost midyear and a replacement was not found. The students were instructed by a rotation of substitute teachers and lesson plans were provided by the math coach.
7th grade math FAST (PM3) was 2 percentage points below the state average. This was due to staffing issues in the math department. The 7th grade math teachers were new to Silver Sands and the math curriculum.
8th grade ELA FAST (PM3) was 3 percentage points below the state average. This was due to attendance and discipline issues among the 8th grade student population. Thirty-one of the 8th grade students had 2 or more EWS indicators.

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

The components that showed the most improvement are the FAST PM3 scores of our ELL student population (46% on ELA and Math). The new actions taken in this area were the new ELL teacher who worked closely with the reading coach and the ELL para professional to serve the ELL students.

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

According the the EWS data from Part I, two potential areas of concern are discipline/referral rate and student attendance. Data showed that 320 students had 10% or more days of absences and 239 students had 1 or more suspension.

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

1. SWD
2. 8th grade Pre-Algebra
3. Attendance
4. Discipline

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Classroom Walkthrough data from the 2022-2023 school year indicated that there was a need for explicit , benchmark-aligned instruction. Additionally, FAST PM3 data revealed that only 50% of our students reached proficiency in ELA and 56% in Math. With an increased focus on target-task alignment, student proficiency will increase on state assessments.

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

By May 2024, 60% of our student will score a Level 3 or higher on the FAST PM 3 Assessment. By May of 2024, 90% of our teachers will provide students with explicit, benchmark-aligned instruction and student engagement tasks, as evidenced by data collected from the administrators' use of the Look-For Tool. By April 2024. the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 to 3 support will decrease by 80%

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

Administrators will make frequent visits to classrooms recording evidence of benchmark-aligned instruction on the Look-for Tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Todd Leathead (tjleathe@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.)

Evidence-based interventions to be implemented:
The Look-fors as indicated by the Opportunity Myth Model. It will be monitored through the use of the Look-For Tool by administrators.

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

Through the process of data analysis during The Administrators' Institute and SLT, we determined that the school was not meeting the expectation for benchmark-aligned instruction. It was determined that instruction and tasks were not aligned to the rigor of the benchmark in all core subjects. This data was collected through the process of learning walks, both school-based and district, walk throughs by administration, coaches, TOAs,
department heads and district specialists. During these walk throughs it was observed that the benchmarks being taught did not align to the academic language, rigor, and activities in the learning environment.

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.

The action steps that will be taken to address this area of focus include Look-For Walks which are to be led by administration, academic coaches, district specialists and department heads. Administration and academic coaches will monitor the posting of benchmarks in each class.

Teachers will be trained on benchmark aligned instruction through ERPLs and PLCs and the importance of the being being taught aligns to the academic language, rigor, and activities in the learning environment. We will implement this by having teachers lead with unpacking the targeted areas of the benchmark, referencing the benchmark, then determining if the success criteria has been met.

Person Responsible: Todd Leathead (tjleathe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will be completed in its entirety by May 2024.

#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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, 320 of our students had below 90% attendance rate. We also had an increase in disruptive, disrespectful, and sometimes violent behavior that interrupted the learning environment. These behavior issues led to loss of instructional time. This loss of instructional time led to not reaching the set goals on FAST PM 3 and other statewide assessments. Due to these factors, teachers and staff have a greater need to cultivate a positive environment that leads positive student behavior. This will ensure the safety and security of all students on campus.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 320 students were below 90% attendance. This will be measured through TEAMs discussing attendance, initiating their own attendance incentives and PSTs will be initiated as needed.

Decrease in disruptive student behaviors by utilizing positive referrals and the continued use of PBIS with an increase in the related incentives and activities. Increase in student achievement will be measured by progress monitoring, district assessment and teacher data such as communication logs.

School counselors will assess quarter grades to ensure promotion to next grade level as well as appropriately meeting grade level goals on statewide assessments.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year 320 students were below 90% attendance. This will be monitored through TEAMs discussing attendance, initiating their own attendance incentives. Attendance will also be monitored and the appropriate steps will be taken after students have missed 15 days.

School counselors will assess PSTs to determine if referrals to school social worker need to be made. School counselors will monitor quarter grades to ensure promotion to next grade level as well as appropriately meeting grade level goals on state wide assessments.

A specific TOA position will concentrate on the implementation and use of PBIS strategies throughout our school campus. This will involve all employees and students.

We will also monitor all of the Early Warning Systems components to see if there are any glaring areas of concern that need attention.

Disciple TOAs will assist in monitoring student trends in referrals and positive

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Todd Leathead (tjleathe@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.)

Implementation of PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support)
Teacher Teaming
PSTs
Data chats with academic coaches, administrators, and district specialists.
Progress monitoring (FAST)
Early Warning Systems in focus
Discipline referrals in focus
Student attendance
Teacher attendance

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, 320 of our students had below 90% attendance rate. We also had an increase in student disruptive, disrespectful, and sometimes violent behavior that interrupted the learning environment. Due to these disruptions, the set goal for grade level wide assessments was not met. This was determined through test scores, PLCs and walk throughs.

If the school increases the use of a researched based program (PBIS) that has proven to increase student achievement, then an increase in academic performance will be measurable as well as a decrease in student off-task disruptive behaviors.

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.

PBIS expectations for the school year for all staff in August 2023.
Training for teachers on Teaming expectations for the school year provided in August 2023 with follow-up training throughout the year as provided by the district.
Continued MTSS training for all teachers throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Todd Leathead (tjleathe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

Our ESSA data indicated that our SWD population was below the Federal Index of 41% for 2 years and below 32% (31%) for 1 year. This indicates that we need to provide more rigorous specially-designed instruction and the instructional practice of benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

By May 2024, ESSA SWD student population will have a Federal Index score of 42%. By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide the SWD student population with rigorous specially-designed instruction. By April 2024, the percent of ESE SF Tier 2 and 3 teachers will decrease by 80%.

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

School administration will review specially designed instruction during monthly data review meetings. ESE administration and district support will provide support in the development of Specially Designed Instruction (SDI). Administration will utilize the Look-For tool during classroom walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of Specially Designed Instruction. School Administration will collaborate to review trends and make adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelli Edgell (kjedgell@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.)

Specially Designed Instruction as outlined in IDEA is the adapting instruction and content delivery to address the unique needs of the student as a result of the identified disability and to provide access to the core curriculum.

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

SDI was chosen based on the needs of our SWD population The use of SDI will increase the ESSA Federal index of our SWD population to 42% as measured by state assessments.

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 administration and district staff will provide training and support in SDI.
Administration will utilize the Look-For tool during classroom walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of Specially Designed Instruction.
School Administration and district support will collaborate to review trends and make adjustments.

Person Responsible: Kelli Edgell (kjedgell@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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

Our ESSA data indicated that our ELL population was below the Federal Index of 41% for 1 year (39%). This indicates that we need to provide more rigorous, differentiated instruction and the instructional practice of benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

By May 2024, ESSA ELL student population will have a Federal Index score of 42%. By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide the ELL student population with rigorous specially-designed instruction. By April 2024, the percent of ESE ELL Tier 2 and 3 teachers will decrease by 80%.

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

School administration will review differentiated instruction during PLC data review meetings. Administration and district personnel will provide support in the development of differentiated instruction appropriate to the needs of ELL students. Administration will utilize the Look-For tool during classroom walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of differentiated instruction. School Administration will collaborate to review trends and make adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelli Edgell (kjedgell@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.)

Differentiated instruction is the best practice resource to assist teachers ensure ELL students are able to thrive in a rigorous educational environment (Corwin, 2018).

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

Differentiated was chosen based on the needs of our ELL population The use of differentiated instruction will increase the ESSA Federal index of our ELL population to 42% as measured by state assessments.

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 administration and district staff will provide training and support in differentiated instruction. Administration will utilize the Look-For tool during classroom walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of differentiated instruction.
School Administration and district support will collaborate to review trends and make adjustments.

Person Responsible: Kelli Edgell (kjedgell@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

<div style="background: navy; color: white;">

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).

</div>

Funds will be used to support teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

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.

SIP will be published on school website, hard copies made available to parents/community members in front office. Information shared with staff at faculty meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Archived survey information indicates a 95% satisfaction rate among parents/families/community stakeholders. We will continue to be transparent, publishing information as necessary through school website, stakeholder meetings, etc. We are in the process of reestablishing a PTSA at our school this year which will give parents additional opportunities to be involved.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We will continue to work aggressively with members of our teaching ranks who have less than two years of experience to improve their instructional practices. An Early Release Professional Development session has already been scheduled with all teachers regarding acceleration and enrichment. We are also making sure students have opportunities to be enrolled in advanced, honors, and accelerated courses, whenever possible.

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))

Information regarding ESSA subgroups was reviewed prior to the development of the plan.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$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