Spruce Creek High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Spruce Creek High School

801 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

http://www.sprucecreekhigh.com/

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.

Spruce Creek High School provides all students with a challenging, creative curriculum that fosters graduates who are knowledgeable, contributing members of our community and world.

Hawks SOAR with our Student Centered, Opportunity Driven, Academically Engaging and Relevant Curriculum!
How will YOUR story take flight?

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision at Spruce Creek High School is to create a better world through 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
Sparger, Todd	Principal	As the principal of SCHS, he is the head instructional leader on campus. He ensures the SIP is implemented with fidelity.
Adkins, Shantell	Assistant Principal	Mr. Adkins is in charge of new teachers and 9th grade discipline. He will monitor data related to discipline and teacher retention.
Morris, Vonda	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Morris is a math teacher who is also working as our math coach for a few periods a day. She is in charge of working with the math department on student achievement.
Miles, Danyalle	Teacher, ESE	As our ESE department chair, she is in charge of working with the ESE department to ensure goals related to SWD are met.
Cappiello, Karie	School Counselor	Mrs. Cappiello is the head of guidance, our IB coordinator, and part of the leadership team. She works closely with graduation assurance.
Clark, Kevin	Assistant Principal	ESE AP, he monitors anything related to SWD
Henderson, Susan	Graduation Coach	Mrs. Henderson is our graduation assurance coach. She works directly with students and teachers to ensure all students are on the right path for graduation.
Murray, Samantha	SAC Member	As SAC Chair, Mrs. Murray works with the school leadership team and SAC to help develop the SIP.
Sayyah, Gillian	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers to ensure they are supported and can effectively implement instructional strategies tied to the benchmark standards.
Hammond, Jana	Assistant Principal	As the Curriculum AP, Dr. Hammond works closely with all teachers to ensure that instructional standards are being met.

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.

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, we went over the climate survey with the faculty and staff in a whole group meeting. We discussed different trends and potential action steps toward improvement. We continue to work together as a school at faculty meetings and ERPLs throughout the year to address the targeted areas. SAC mirrors those same discussions and looks at the same information, pulling in parent

and student voice. Our SAC meetings are open to all, but our voting members have a strong representation of parents and students.

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))

Key members of our school leadership team are responsible for monitoring different aspects of the plan. The Curriculum AP, the Academic Coach, and the Graduation Assurance Monitor work closely together to ensure the SIP is regularly monitored for effective implementation.

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	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	56	44	50	58	46	51	62		
ELA Learning Gains				52			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			43		
Math Achievement*	41	28	38	33	33	38	38		
Math Learning Gains				34			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			30		
Science Achievement*	77	68	64	75	30	40	82		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	59	66	67	40	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	94	90	89	93	65	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	67	65	65	62	62	67	54		
ELP Progress	67	44	45	50			73		

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
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	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	93

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	36	Yes	4	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	41			
HSP	63			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	57			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP	54			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

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	56			41			77	62		94	67	67
SWD	19			18			35	27		22	6	
ELL	41			25			67	38		62	7	67
AMI												
ASN	85			74			91	88		93	6	
BLK	32			18			50	25		30	6	
HSP	55			37			78	57		60	6	
MUL	65			24			84	45		52	6	
PAC												
WHT	58			46			79	66		70	6	
FRL	46			30			66	54		52	7	64

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	58	52	35	33	34	35	75	67		93	62	50
SWD	15	31	24	13	30	37	35	31		86	20	
ELL	35	54	53	21	36	27	56	33		94	13	50
AMI												
ASN	87	73		57	32		95	88		100	88	
BLK	31	38	24	15	34	43	49	46		88	36	
HSP	57	56	52	35	40	33	74	61		89	67	27
MUL	66	62		32	38		83	79		100	62	
PAC												
WHT	59	51	36	36	33	32	76	69		94	62	
FRL	47	46	35	26	29	33	66	58		87	47	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	62	53	43	38	26	30	82	70		94	54	73
SWD	19	40	38	20	33	35	54	48		88	8	
ELL	35	41	39	35	41	30	73	27		100	50	73
AMI												
ASN	87	71		62	52		90	100		100	84	
BLK	39	36	20	21	25	27	50	44		91	27	
HSP	56	49	52	35	25	29	81	64		96	48	69
MUL	59	53	55	16	15		72	79		93	56	
PAC												
WHT	64	54	46	41	25	32	86	72		94	55	75
FRL	49	49	43	29	30	29	69	65		90	35	70

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	54%	45%	9%	50%	4%
09	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	48%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	32%	1%	50%	-17%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	39%	7%	48%	-2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	65%	11%	63%	13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	57%	4%	63%	-2%

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.

We saw modest increases in much of our data this year except for our subgroups that include students with disabilities and African American students. We had new teachers in several key positions and the PLCs were getting reestablished with new personnel. Other contributing factors include the fact that our academic coach left mid-year, so there was less support for the teachers in tested subject areas. The students in the subgroups had attendance issues, which may have been impacted by displacements due to two hurricanes that caused flooding in many of our feeder neighborhoods. We continue to see some behavior issues that we believe were exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic school shut-down. We

focused on PBIS, but it was a new system for us so it is still growing. The state test also had a new format this year that makes it difficult to compare results. We continue to see steady numbers without huge increases or decreases in performance across the board.

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

We have seen a consistent decline in our US History scores for several years. We went from 70% in 2021 to 67% in 2022 and down to 55% in 2023. We believe this decline has several contributing factors. First, these students had a disruption in their middle school years when they receive key social studies instruction including Civics due to the pandemic closure. Many are entering US History with less background knowledge than they previously had. In addition, we have had new personnel in our US History team each year, causing new teachers to have to learn the curriculum. Last year, our academic coach resigned mid-year, leaving them with less support than they would have benefitted from.

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.

Our biggest gap when compared to the state average was Algebra. We had a 36% pass rate and the state average was 54%. The state average includes middle schools and most students who are strong in math take Algebra before they ever get to high school, so most high schools are below the state average for Algebra. When compared to high schools in our district and across the state, we are comparable or higher. Our Algebra scores are trending up, with a 13% increase this past year. We have had significant personnel changes in the Algebra team after some teacher retirements, but even with the changes we have seen an increase in pass rates. This year we have an almost entirely new team in our Algebra PLC, so they will be working to build more momentum and make even more positive change.

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

This is difficult to ascertain given the fact that the test is different for most subject areas, but Algebra 1 showed a 13% increase with the new test. We believe some of that is because it is a single day test and students reported that the new format was easier to navigate. We also had new personnel in Algebra. They had common planning and additional support from the academic coach before she resigned. A member of the admin team was assigned to the PLC to help with the planning process. They worked on aligning instruction to the new benchmarks and using data to drive instruction.

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

We need to focus on US History and on the success of our students with disabilities and our African American students in ELA and Math.

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

1) Improving ELA, ALG, GEOM, and US History scores and first time pass rates
2) Specifically relate instructional practices to the benchmark
3) Decrease level one referrals for student with three or more EWS indicators

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

We would like to focus on making sure the faculty members who are new to Spruce Creek High School have the support they need to be successful and feel connected to our school community.

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

Our goal is to lose less than 10% of the new hires at the end of the year.

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

The teacher retention team will check in in with the new teachers led by Shon Duncan and Mr. Adkins.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@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 Center for Teaching Quality did research that said that "support from colleagues and administrators is one of the most significant factors in a teacher's decision to stay or leave the profession. By ensuring that teachers feel supported and cared for, administrators can keep teachers satisfied in their current positions." So we will be increasing our level of support.

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

It is evidenced based and makes sense.

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.

100% of the faculty and staff who are new to our school will be paired with someone who will check in with them weekly to ensure their needs are being met. We have a team (Shon Duncan, Kelly Bundza, Tony Plowden, Shantell Adkins, and Gillian Sayyah) working with them.

Person Responsible: Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing all year.

#2. 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.

Our area of focus will be that teachers will provide explicit instruction aligned to the benchmarks and intended learning. All teachers will focus on instruction that aligns to state standards and district curriculum plans with a focus on increasing literacy skills in all content areas.

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

100% of our tested subject area teachers will provide explicit instruction aligned to the benchmarks. This will result in a 3% increase of passing rates on the Algebra 1 EOC, Geometry EOC, FAST PM 3 10th, FAST PM 3 9th, and US History EOC. 100% of our tested subject area teachers will participate in common planning with their PLC and will be provided with support from our academic coach and an administrator.

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

Administrators will look for indicators on their walk-throughs. The academic coach will work with the teachers during their PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Sparger (tjsparge@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.)

Curriculum maps will be reviewed in PLC to ensure teachers keep benchmarks in the forefront of instruction while staying on pace with the curriculum map. Administrators will attend PLC meetings and assist with effective instructional strategies.

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

This ties in to the district initiative related to our district strategic goals.

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.

PLCs will work weekly to ensure understanding of the benchmarks. PLCs will collaborate on best practices to utilize when delivering explicit instruction.

Person Responsible: Todd Sparger (tjsparge@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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 area of focus will be that teachers will provide explicit instruction aligned to the benchmarks and intended learning, with a focus on meeting the needs of Black/African-American students. All teachers will focus on instruction that aligns to state standards and district curriculum plans with a focus on increasing literacy skills in all content areas.

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

100% of our tested subject area teachers will provide explicit instruction aligned to the benchmarks. This will result in a 3% increase of passing rates on the Algebra 1 EOC, Geometry EOC, FAST PM 3 10th, FAST PM 3 9th, and US History EOC for our Black/African-American students. 100% of our tested subject area teachers will participate in common planning with their PLC and will be provided with support from our academic coach and an administrator.

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

Administrators will look for indicators on their walk-throughs. The academic coach will work with the teachers during their PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shantell Adkins (sgadkins@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.)

Curriculum maps will be reviewed in PLC to ensure teachers keep benchmarks in the forefront of instruction while staying on pace with the curriculum map. Administrators will attend PLC meetings and assist with effective instructional strategies.

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

This ties in to the district initiative related to our district strategic goals.

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

#4. 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 area of focus will be that teachers will provide explicit instruction aligned to the benchmarks and intended learning, with a focus on meeting the needs of SWD. All teachers will focus on instruction that aligns to state standards and district curriculum plans with a focus on increasing literacy skills in all content areas.

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

100% of our tested subject area teachers will provide explicit instruction aligned to the benchmarks. This will result in a 3% increase of passing rates on the Algebra 1 EOC, Geometry EOC, FAST PM 3 10th, FAST PM 3 9th, and US History EOC for our SWD. 100% of our tested subject area teachers will participate in common planning with their PLC and will be provided with support from our academic coach and an administrator.

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

Administrators will look for indicators on their walk-throughs. The academic coach will work with the teachers during their PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Clark (kdclark@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.)

Curriculum maps will be reviewed in PLC to ensure teachers keep benchmarks in the forefront of instruction while staying on pace with the curriculum map. Administrators will attend PLC meetings and assist with effective instructional strategies.

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

This ties in to the district initiative related to our district strategic goals.

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).

Teachers submit requests for funds and include how it ties into the school improvement plan. Those requests are reviewed by the Curriculum AP and the SAC committee before approval.