

Volusia County Schools

# Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>18</b>

# Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts

565 S LAKEVIEW DR UNIT 110, Lake Helen, FL 32744

<http://www.ivyhawnschool.com/>

## 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.**

To foster intelligence, individuality and artistry for a lifetime.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

A leadership and collaborative culture, committed to continuous improvement in teaching and learning, will raise student achievement in both academics and arts and prepare all students with 21st century education.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Suhr, Danielle	Principal	Supervises leadership team, curriculum and professional development, calendar and master scheduling, and mission and vision of Ivy Hawn.

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

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

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

The school leadership team has met with our parent organization, teacher team leaders, and our board and have provided their input during the SIP development process.

**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 school and stakeholders review data from state progress monitoring assessments, student achievement on end of course exams, attendance, and climate and culture surveys. The SIP is monitored by the leadership team and governing board and reviewed each year with the board upon completion.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	32%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	54%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	22	32	25	24	29	34	20	18	21	225
One or more suspensions	9	4	2	6	12	13	14	12	5	77
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	8	1	4	1	10	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	16	10	7	11	27	25	22	32	152
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	8	8	12	6	19	24	26	14	17	134
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

**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	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	66	48	53	70	49	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				57			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			54		
Math Achievement*	66	45	55	66	32	42	64		
Math Learning Gains				64			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			46		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	72	56	52	71	45	54	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	81	64	68	84	52	59	79		
Middle School Acceleration	79	53	70	82	44	51	79		
Graduation Rate		76	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		43	53		62	70			
ELP Progress	58	58	55	36	68	70	63		

\* 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	626
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	46			
HSP	59			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	60			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	39	Yes	2	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	53			
HSP	54			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	55			

**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	66			66			72	81	79			58
SWD	24			35			36	20			5	
ELL	44			40							3	58
AMI												
ASN	100			100							2	
BLK	58			50			31				3	
HSP	50			51			54	57	75		7	64
MUL	84			72							2	
PAC												
WHT	69			70			81	86	78		6	
FRL	54			49			54	73	65		6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	70	57	39	66	64	57	71	84	82			36
SWD	27	31	21	31	52	59	25	63				
ELL	45	41	36	38	53	62	35					36
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	53	47	33	42	50	54	71		70			
HSP	58	40	36	50	63	57	53	85	68			27
MUL	74	59		74	68		75					
PAC												
WHT	73	63	41	71	66	58	75	84	87			
FRL	58	49	36	51	61	56	60	73	76			30

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	72	68	54	64	47	46	69	79	79			63
SWD	31	53	49	31	45	44	19	38				
ELL	46	62	44	42	32	36	30	64				63

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
AMI												
ASN	100			91								
BLK	64	78	64	43	56	46	41					
HSP	61	64	45	52	38	41	55	65	74			57
MUL	68	71		72	36							
PAC												
WHT	76	69	53	69	48	47	75	83	78			
FRL	67	66	55	57	44	38	63	64	82			57

**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
05	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	44%	23%	47%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	39%	18%	47%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	42%	20%	47%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	54%	9%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	44%	19%	48%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	57%	22%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	61%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	37%	3%	55%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	47%	21%	44%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	51%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	32%	54%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	39%	57%	48%	48%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	65%	16%	66%	15%

### 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.**

ELA lowest 25th percentile component showed the lowest performance. We have continued to expand our advanced classes and curriculum to produce learning gains for our advanced and regular track students but have seen a need for more intense services and supports for our struggling learners.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile component showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Previously, Ivy Hawn had a double block of ELA but was removed as it showed a decline in overall ELA scores. However, it could be a factor in the decline for our lowest 25th percentile subgroup.

**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.**

Ivy Hawn continues to achieve above the state and district in every category except for the state in our ELA lowest 25th percentile. This also had the greatest gap as we see increased intense supports for our newly enrolled students.

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

The component with the most improvement was in middle school acceleration. We placed our math acceleration classes with one teacher who could focus on teaching from a high school perspective with reduced preps.

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

After the COVID shutdown, we continue seeing a few students with chronic absenteeism. We are also seeing a rise in aggressive behaviors with our younger students-especially those in kindergarten.

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

Higher achievement for our ELA Lowest 25th percentile students, increase overall Math achievement with a focus in eighth grade.

**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 Intervention****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 ELA lowest 25th percentile students are not making the growth they have in previous years. We have specifically identified interventions put in place with fidelity as a main concern in this area as well as identifying student needs earlier with our MTSS process.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In ELA, the lowest 25th percentile students' average will rise from 39 to 45.

**Monitoring:**

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

With the installation of a Dean of Instruction, they will monitor our MTSS process and have assigned MTSS chairs for each grade level to monitor student achievement and intervention outcomes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Danielle Suhr (dksuhr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***



## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Increase direct instruction in math and ELA for students with disabilities who are not performing at grade level and/or not meeting their academic goals.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities perform at 27%, but we want to increase their overall achievement to 32%.

### Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through state testing and progress reports on student's academic goals from their IEPs.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Suhr (dksuhr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. 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.

Ivy Hawn will continue to recruit top candidates and grow the mentor program to train new teachers and staff members.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

90% of all teachers hired will be certified within their first three years at Ivy Hawn.

**Monitoring:**

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

Our mentor program will focus on certification and training to retain new hires.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Danielle Suhr (dksuhr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

## Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

No