
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

University High School

1000 W RHODE ISLAND AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://www.uhstitans.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.

At University High School we believe in the promise of every student. We are committed to preparing students for success in a rapidly changing world. Together we are a vibrant, close-knit learning community of diverse backgrounds, talent and perspectives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In concurrence with Volusia County's vision statement, "Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society."

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
Chenoweth, Karen	Principal	The Principal oversees all roles, responsibilities, and daily operations of the school.
Boles, Chester	Assistant Principal	Mr. Boles is the Data Assistant Principal and oversees the master schedule, school counseling, graduation and the Social Studies department.
Carter, Ben	Assistant Principal	Mr. Carter is the Discipline/Facilities/Athletic Assistant Principal. He oversees safety and security, athletics, facilities, and the ELA department.
Grieve, Bobbie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Grieve is the Curriculum Assistant Principal. She oversees curriculum needs of the teachers, facilitates PLCs campus wide, Cambridge, Testing, New Teachers, Interns, School Improvement Plan, Professional Learning and the Math Department. Monitors school-wide data throughout the school year.
Hughes, Jennie	Assistant Principal	Dr. Hughes is the ESE Assistant Principal. She oversees IEPs, compliance, and all ESE programs on the campus.
Robinson, Pamela	Assistant Principal	Ms. Robinson is the Discipline and ESOL Assistant Principal. She oversees FTE, ESOL and CTE teachers.
Berner, Linda	Reading Coach	Mrs. Berner is our Reading Coach. She implements professional learning for reading and writing in all content areas, provides one on one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyzes the Achieve 3000, B.E.S.T., and district assessment data to determine student placement in appropriate course and coordinates the school-wide literacy plan.
Dawson, Kristen	Math Coach	Mrs. Dawson is our Math Coach. She provides one on one assistance to classroom teachers to improve student achievement, analyze F.A.S.T. and district assessment data to determine student placement in appropriate course.

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 Principal and/or Curriculum AP will provide an update of school data from the previous year at the first School Advisory Council meeting and allow all stakeholders to provide input in our School Improvement Plan. The Principal and/or Curriculum AP will provide updates throughout the school year during each School Advisory Council meeting. The Principal and/or Curriculum AP updates faculty and staff on school data and the School Improvement Plan throughout the school year.

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 Principal and/or Curriculum AP will provide weekly updates to the admin team and PLCs. monthly updates at faculty meetings and school leadership meetings. The school will use the Stock Take Process to monitor the effectiveness of our action steps for each Area of Focus and make adjustments as needed based off the student data.

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	51%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	905
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	324
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	44	50	45	46	51	48		
ELA Learning Gains				47			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29			46		
Math Achievement*	28	28	38	28	33	38	29		
Math Learning Gains				41			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			22		
Science Achievement*	66	68	64	63	30	40	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	59	66	65	40	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	92	90	89	92	65	61	82		
College and Career Acceleration	55	65	65	76	62	67	47		
ELP Progress	42	44	45	40			50		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	92

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	4	
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	54			
HSP	50			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	63			
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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	46			
HSP	48			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	57			
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	41			28			66	68		92	55	42
SWD	20			10			30	47		26	7	35
ELL	13			17			28	45		40	7	42
AMI												
ASN	43			44			71	86			5	
BLK	32			21			63	68		43	6	
HSP	34			26			50	61		48	7	42
MUL	58			16			73	73		53	6	
PAC												
WHT	47			33			75	72		60	6	
FRL	35			24			58	61		49	7	38

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	47	29	28	41	47	63	65		92	76	40
SWD	19	37	29	14	35	42	28	42		80	49	32
ELL	15	27	20	13	37	55	30	31		90	79	40
AMI												
ASN	61	58		28	35		89	70		100	84	
BLK	28	34	32	22	43	56	44	57		88	60	
HSP	39	42	23	22	38	49	54	55		92	75	42
MUL	51	55		40	50		76	87		92	82	
PAC												
WHT	52	53	34	33	42	42	69	73		92	79	
FRL	38	42	28	24	37	44	56	61		89	74	39

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	48	51	46	29	31	22	69	68		82	47	50
SWD	17	39	38	13	25	25	48	53		69	22	59
ELL	15	43	47	19	34	29	45	40		79	18	50
AMI												
ASN	62	62		50	50					93	43	
BLK	37	48	47	19	20	13	58	68		75	48	
HSP	41	46	42	27	29	22	61	60		83	33	46
MUL	53	61		30	40		80	77		96	61	
PAC												
WHT	54	54	48	33	33	23	74	74		81	54	64
FRL	40	47	45	25	27	20	62	64		77	40	48

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	41%	45%	-4%	50%	-9%
09	2023 - Spring	41%	44%	-3%	48%	-7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	32%	-14%	50%	-32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	39%	-3%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	65%	-2%	63%	0%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	63%	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.

Based on the 22-23 district data scrub, math showed the lowest performance with 31%. Although math is our lowest we did have a 3 point increase overall. One of the major contributing factors was our Math coach was in a classroom until the third quarter which meant there was no support for our math teachers in regard to new benchmarks and the new state assessment. Other contributing factors would be low attendance for our students, discipline of our students, and PLC and Early Release Wednesdays were lost due to the hurricanes. We are still recovering from the learning gaps due to the loss of learning after

COVID. Algebra and Geometry teachers also struggled with staying on pace and following the curriculum map.

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

Based on the 22-23 district data scrub, ELA had the greatest decline from the prior year with 2% decrease. One major contributing factor was our Reading Coach was in a classroom during the first nine weeks which did not allow support the ELA and Reading departments. Other contributing factors would be new state assessment, new teachers in the ninth grade PLC, and we had two vacancies in reading, one them being the 9th and 10th grade intensive reading course.

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.

Based on the 22-23 district data scrub, math showed the lowest performance with 31%. Although math is our lowest we did have a 3 point increase overall. One of the major contributing factors was our Math coach was in a classroom until the third quarter which meant there was no support for our math teachers in regard to new benchmarks and the new state assessment. Other contributing factors would be low attendance for our students, discipline of our students, and PLC and Early Release Wednesdays were lost due to the hurricanes. We are still recovering from the learning gaps due to the loss of learning after COVID. Algebra and Geometry teachers also struggled with staying on pace and following the curriculum map.

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

Based on the 22-23 district data scrub, Algebra had the most improvement with an 8 point increase. We reorganized the the entire Algebra PLC and there was more targeted focus on planning and tracking student data.

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

Based on the EWS report our two areas of concern will be

- attendance below 90% (749 students)
- course failures in ELA and Math (607 students in ELA, 570 students in Math)

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

1. Benchmark aligned instruction and making sure the rigor and student tasks are at the aligned level
2. Improve all student attendance to above 90%
3. PLCs focused on aligning student learning tasks to the benchmarks and increase student/teacher collaboration
4. PLCs analyze the district data to see areas of weakness and develop interventions and remediation plans

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.

2022-2023 District scrubbed data indicated a proficiency rate of 43% in ELA, 31% in Math, 65% in Biology, and 66% in US History. 2021-2022 ESSA subgroup state data indicated a proficiency of 37% in SWD and 40% in ELL.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 53% in ELA, 41% in Math, 75% in Biology, 76% in US History, 47% in SWD, and 50% in ELL. After each district assessment the PLC, administrator, and coach will conduct a data dive of each benchmark to create a remediation plan for students who did not meet proficiency. During the data dive, ELL and SWD strategies will be reviewed and changed as needed.

Monitoring:

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

- State data and district assessments
- PLC minutes
- Walkthrough data (look-fors)
- Curriculum Maps
- Gradebook - formative and summative data, D/F report, and assignments aligned to the benchmark

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@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.)

Our evidence-based intervention being implemented for the Area of Focus of Benchmark-aligned Instruction is from John Hattie's Feedback with an effect size of .75.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Feedback has an effect size of .75, with the average effect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when feedback is implemented with fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Share with the entire faculty and staff the 22-23 state assessment data and school grade. Review the three Areas of Focus for the 23-24 school year. The first Area of Focus is on Benchmark-Aligned

Instruction to increase student achievement in all content areas, including ELL and SWD students. To help increase student achievement in the area of Benchmark-Aligned Instruction we will focus on feedback from John Hattie's studies.

Person Responsible: Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the end of August 2023

Teachers will use their curriculum map to make sure all benchmarks are covered and the teachers will use their test specs to make sure the benchmarks are taught with the level of rigor needed to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Admin will attend weekly PLCs and reivew minutes weekly

PLCs, coaches, and administrators will progress monitor all district assessments and CSPM data when available.

Person Responsible: Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: After each district and/or CSPM assessment

Frequent walkthroughs by administrators and academic coaches.

Person Responsible: Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022-2023 District scrubbed data indicated a proficiency rate of 43% in ELA, 31% in Math, 65% in Biology, and 66% in US History. 2021-2022 ESSA subgroup state data indicated a proficiency of 37% in SWD and 40% in ELL

Measurable Outcome:

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 53% in ELA, 41% in Math, 75% in Biology, 76% in US History, 47% in SWD, and 50% in ELL. Teachers will be open to the feedback provided by both the coaches and administration. Under the New Teacher Center, each coach will have 15 teachers to provide additional support which will increase student achievement. Administrators will work with the coaches to discuss areas of concerns and teacher who made need targeted support.

Monitoring:

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

- Walkthrough data
- Student achievement
- Survey results (feedback from teachers for what they need/want for professional learning)
- PLC minutes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@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.)

Our evidence-based intervention being implemented for the Area of Focus of Instructional Coaching/ Professional Learning is from John Hattie's Formative Teacher Evaluation with an effect size of .91.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Formative Teacher Evaluation has an effect size of .91, with the average effect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .91, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when formative teacher evaluation is implemented with fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

PLC leaders will be trained on the 6 Essential Characteristics of a PLC and creating their norms for the school year during pre-planning to give our PLCs a reboot.

Person Responsible: Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Pre-Planning

PLCs will be structured to increase student achievement by focusing on the four look-fors: (1) teacher provides explicit instruction aligned to the benchmark and intended learning, (2) teacher provides task aligned to the benchmark and intended learning, (3) teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning, and (4) teacher provides students will opportunities to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Bobbie Grieve (bjgrieve@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the end of September

Admin and coaches will conduct frequent walkthroughs to monitor the look-fors mentioned above. Admin and coaches will provide feedback based off the walkthrough data and will coach teachers in the areas that need improvement. Teachers identified as high need will be listed on our coaches' caseload to ensure they are receiving the support they need.

Person Responsible: Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#3. 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.

Student Attendance will be our area of focus. After reviewing the 22-23 Early Warning System report we discovered we had 26% of our students who had attendance below 90%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Early Warning System report will reflect a minimum decrease rate of 16% of our students who had attendance below 90%.

Monitoring:

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

- Attendance reports
- Monitor the form created for teachers to provide input on specific students and attendance related issues
- MTSS process

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Chenoweth (kchenowe@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.)

Our evidence-based intervention being implemented for the Area of Focus of Student Attendance is from John Hattie's Response Intervention with an effect size of 1.07.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Response Intervention has an effect size of 1.07, with the average effect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 1.07, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when response intervention is implemented with fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Attendance reports will be monitored weekly by the Attendance Administrator, the Attendance Clerk and the TOA.

Person Responsible: Pamela Robinson (pnrobins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Attendance form will be created and shared with the teachers so the teachers can provide information about a student. For example, if a parent emails the teacher about a student's absence they can upload it

to the form so the Attendance Administrator, Attendance Clerk, and TOA can view and make adjustments accordingly.

Person Responsible: Pamela Robinson (pnrobins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

The Attendance Administrator, Attendance Clerk and TOA will reach out to parents of students who have attendance below 90% and encourage the student to attend school on a regular basis. The MTSS process will be started as well.

Person Responsible: Pamela Robinson (pnrobins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Whenever a student falls below the 90% attendance.