

Volusia County Schools

Southwestern 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Southwestern Middle School

605 W NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, Deland, FL 32720

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

We commit to empowering all learners through consistency, innovation, and support to positively impact the global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southwestern is a FUN, inclusive supportive environment where meaningful relationships lead to 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
Jefferson, Tranisha	Assistant Principal	
DiGrazia, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	
Copeland, Jacquese	Principal	
Ruppen, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Bryant, Bernadette	Instructional Coach	
Pieri, Suzanne	Instructional Coach	
Johnson, Kung	Dean	
Perrino, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Klimas, Keith	Teacher, K-12	
Azucar, Holly	Instructional Media	
Fontaine, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	
Harper, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	

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 Advisory Council is used to fulfill the requirements. We have a representation from all stakeholders on our SAC team. Their input is gathered at monthly meetings.

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 through our quarterly stocktake meetings. The school will take the feedback and new actions steps to revise and move forward to meeting our 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)	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	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	75	73	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	43	43	116
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	8	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	7	9	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	78	57	207
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	59	60	196
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	51	26	104

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	55	59	59	173

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	4	5	7	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7

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	60	73	80	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	69	64	195
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	55	72	104	231
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	65	82	212
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	28	38	86

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	59	68	79	206

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	1	4	9	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8

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	60	73	80	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	69	64	195
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	72	104	231
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	65	82	212
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	28	38	86

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	59	68	79	206

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	1	4	9	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8

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*	47	44	49	45	45	50	45		
ELA Learning Gains				45			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			36		
Math Achievement*	58	48	56	45	31	36	38		
Math Learning Gains				51			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			40		
Science Achievement*	47	49	49	46	46	53	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	81	67	68	74	49	58	65		
Middle School Acceleration	40	62	73	58	43	49	63		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					65	70			
ELP Progress	53	31	40	56	69	76	44		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
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	29	Yes	4	4
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	54			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	49			

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	41			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	42			
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	47			
PAC				
WHT	56			
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	47			58			47	81	40			53
SWD	18			31			24	47	27		5	
ELL	27			59			28	61	36		6	53
AMI												
ASN	60			93							2	
BLK	32			38			26	67	36		5	
HSP	43			61			44	81	38		6	57
MUL	46			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			63			57	87	41		5	
FRL	42			52			41	77	33		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	45	45	33	45	51	53	46	74	58			56
SWD	17	36	31	20	36	41	21	43				23
ELL	27	42	33	25	40	44	23	71	50			56
AMI												
ASN	76	71		56	79							

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	32	42	35	28	45	45	31	59	59			
HSP	37	44	29	36	49	51	38	74	54			55
MUL	45	41		43	57							
PAC												
WHT	55	46	33	59	54	60	59	80	57			
FRL	39	43	32	39	50	52	40	68	52			55

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	45	47	36	38	35	40	48	65	63			44
SWD	15	32	27	16	38	37	18	28				11
ELL	29	39	43	25	36	33	15	53				44
AMI												
ASN	57	77		50	54							
BLK	31	37	28	21	28	38	30	54	47			
HSP	38	41	35	32	35	34	35	57	59			45
MUL	52	74		36	45		55					
PAC												
WHT	55	53	38	51	36	44	63	76	67			
FRL	38	44	37	31	35	39	38	59	49			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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	39%	0%	47%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	42%	-1%	47%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	44%	20%	48%	16%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	37%	23%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	32%	35%	50%	17%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	39%	22%	48%	13%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	65%	15%	66%	14%

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.

Geometry was our lowest performance. This was due to lack of core instruction and classroom management. Our trend data shows that we have declined with the number of students proficient for the last 3 years.

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

Geometry showed the greatest decline. This was due to lack of core instruction and classroom management.

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 component that had the greatest gap was 8th grade ELA. This is due to having a full time sub for one semester and the second semester we hired a teacher new to the middle school culture, scheduling and content.

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

Math showed the most improvement. The new actions we took this past year to increase student proficiency was consistent data chats, tutoring, math boot camps. and Saturday team planning.

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

Attendance and the number of students with a level 1 in ELA and MATH.

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA.
2. Continue to increase student achievement in MATH.
3. Close the gap for SWD in ELA and MATH.
4. Increase cultural sensitivity among the adults to better serve ALL students equitably.

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 ELA**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.

Even though ELA increased from the previous year, we didn't meet our SIP goal for ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA proficiency to 55% in 2024. Ninety percent of classroom teachers will provide students with Benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walk-through data. Instructional Coaches will complete at least two coaching cycles with all identified teachers.

Monitoring:

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

The area will be monitored for the desired outcome by classroom walk-throughs looking for the four look fors. Analyzing FAST Data through our Stocktake.

Coaching cycles will be monitored monthly. Coaches and the admin team will meet monthly to review completed coaching cycles and plan for further support if needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Ruppen (jlruppe1@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 that will be implemented is IXL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We selected IXL because teachers can pin point specific benchmarks for students who need extra support.

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.

Create a walk-through schedule that captures the four look fors.

Person Responsible: Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: on going

Coaches will provide content support based on walk through data .

Person Responsible: Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: on going

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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 continuous decline in Geometry and Algebra 1 over the past 3 years is the rational for why this area is selected as a crucial need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome for both accelerated courses are to achieve an 80% or higher with student proficiency. Ninety percent of classroom teachers will provide students with Benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walk-through data. Instructional Coaches will complete at least two coaching cycles with all identified teachers.

Monitoring:

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

Analyzing and discussing VBA's with core teachers during plc's and at Stocktake.

Coaching cycles will be monitored monthly. Coaches and the admin team will meet monthly to review completed coaching cycles and plan for further support if needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@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.)

IXL and a designated highly effective intervention teacher supporting the class daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We selected IXL because teachers can pin point specific benchmarks for students who need extra support. Having another adult work with students will place the student teacher ratio to 1:15, which will assist in meeting the needs and focusing on behavior management so classroom learning can take place,

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.

Create a walk-through schedule that captures the four look fors.

Person Responsible: Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: On going

Coaches will provide content support based on walk through data .

Person Responsible: Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: On going

#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.

According to the 2021-2022 ESSA data we received, we are below the standard of 41% by 11%, making this a crucial need for these students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ESSA sub group by 11% which will meet the standard. Ninety percent of classroom teachers will provide students with Benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walk-through data. Support logs by Case managers for students on IEP/BIP are being uploaded daily.

Monitoring:

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

Analyzing FAST data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@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.)

IXL

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is because it is targeted instruction, aligned to our benchmarks to hold students to high academic standards.

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.

Administration will create walk through schedule and provide feedback to teachers using the walk through tool.

Person Responsible: Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: on going

ESE Admin will verify that logs are being completed daily.

Person Responsible: Stephanie DiGrazia (sadigra2@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: bi-weekly basis

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

There is a high disparity among referrals written for Black students in comparison to White students. Black students at Southwestern Middle School represent 25% of the total student population and White Students represent 46% of the total student population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the number of referrals for Black students from 53% to 23% by June 2024. Teachers will implement 2 SEL circles per week.

Monitoring:

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

Monitor data through FOCUS on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@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.)

Implementing PBIS with fidelity, participating in a cultural sensitivity ERPL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To decrease the number of discipline incidents relating to Black students and gain knowledge of the cultural differences of students on our campus.

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 training

Person Responsible: Bernadette Bryant (bbryant@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Pre-planning

Monthly Share Outs of Best Practice

Person Responsible: Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly Faculty

increase our capacity for who can assist with Restorative Circles
Being consistent with restorative circles; student and teacher: student to student.

Person Responsible: Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: First quarter

Establish a plan for EPRL

Person Responsible: Jacquese Copeland (jjslocum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When:

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).

All Title 1 Funds and School Improvement Funds that are used to support student needs go through a vetting process to ensure that they match student needs and support the goals of our SIP.

Resources:

IXL

Intervention Teacher

Life Skills TOA

PBIS app

Kagan Training for Core Teachers

Collaborative Planning for Core Teachers