Cypress Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cypress Creek Elementary School

6100 S WILLIAMSON BLVD, Port Orange, FL 32128

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/cypresscreek/pages/default.aspx

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Cypress Creek Elementary family will work as a team to encourage student achievement, safety, respect, and citizenship, in order to ensure success of each and every student.

Provide the school'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.

Cypress Creek cares about the success of every student. Our goal is to set high expectations and provide a quality 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
Kania, Kristina	Principal	To lead the leadership team in identifying school-based resources to determine academic and behavioral supports available (both materials and personnel). Monitor school assessment data to ensure progress towards SIP goals. Identify action steps and monitor for effectiveness.
Hemings, Susan	Assistant Principal	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation and monitoring of action steps. To communicate the SIP and Mid-Year review data with stakeholders through the district Stocktake process.
Larrimore, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	To participate in the school leadership team to include ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection.
Suydam, Terri	Teacher, K-12	To participate in the school leadership team to include ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. As the School Advisory Council Chair, ensure that SIP is discussed and input is provided on a monthly basis during the council meeting.
Keany, Mike	Instructional Coach	To participate in the school leadership team to include ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To progress monitor, analyze, interpret, and provide data to the team.
West, Julia	Teacher, K-12	To participate in the school leadership team to include ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection.
Austin, Camille	Teacher, K-12	To participate in the school leadership team to include ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection.

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.

Through School Leadership Team and School Advisory Council which includes teachers, staff, parents, and community members.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored through monthly School Leadership Team meetings, ongoing PLC meetings and through the district Stocktake process which occurs 2x annually.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: A 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	
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	1	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	12

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	9	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	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	6	12	10	16	13	12	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	5	5	5	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	13	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	11	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	5	8	8	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Absent 10% or more days	6	12	10	16	13	12	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	5	5	5	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	13	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	11	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	5	8	8	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
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*	69	52	53	76	53	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				71			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			50		
Math Achievement*	75	55	59	76	42	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				66			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			46		
Science Achievement*	76	62	54	73	55	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	42	60	59	75			52		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	47			
HSP	66			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	55			

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	47			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	72			
HSP	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	88			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	65			

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	69			75			76					42
SWD	27			36			38				4	
ELL	48			45			33				4	42
AMI												
ASN	67			88							2	
BLK	47			47							2	
HSP	63			59			75				3	
MUL	85			77			70				3	
PAC												
WHT	70			76			78				5	43
FRL	57			62			59				5	42

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	76	71	62	76	66	52	73					75
SWD	39	63	56	40	48	36	46					
ELL	50	67	64	55	50							75
AMI												
ASN	76			88								82

							2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS					
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2020-21**	**C & C Accel 2020-21**	**ELP Progress**
BLK	67	80		80	60							
HSP	67	79		67	55		62					
MUL	83	100		87	83							
PAC												
WHT	76	66	54	76	66	51	73					73
FRL	68	68	64	73	60	50	65					70

							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	73	59	50	71	48	46	60					52
SWD	27	25		46	58		42					
ELL	48			44			20					52
AMI												
ASN	82			100								
BLK	54			38								
HSP	74	40		70	50		67					
MUL	58			50								
PAC												
WHT	74	62	56	73	48	44	63					70
FRL	66	60	47	63	54	57	43					65

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	70%	53%	17%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	57%	17%	58%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	80%	57%	23%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	59%	18%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	51%	24%

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.

Math lowest quartile 52 up 8 points from last, which was 46. ELA lowest quartile 62 up 11 points from last year, which was 50. SWD 47% ELL 60% federal percent of points index. Contributing factors were ESE and ELL staffing was inconsistent for portions of the year. Walk to intervention started late due to testing requirements and days missed due to weather. The academic coach was new to the role and minimally utilized for coaching. Teachers were learning new math standards along with new math materials.

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

Although there was no decline in any component, ELA achievement only went up by 3 points. The third-grade team had several medical absences. Problem-solving for new technology and testing procedures. Assessments increased in third grade to earn portfolio points. The testing format changed from pencil and paper to computer-based only.

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.

We are above the state in all component areas. The smallest gap for CCE was Math lowest quartile 52 compared to the state at 49. There was little training prior to the year to support the new math series and support provided from the math department which included anchor charts, powerpoints, and manipulatives supplied for all students to support new standards. Math tutoring for third grade lowest quartile after school did not start until February and was sporadic. Reflex for all students to support math fluency was not used consistently.

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

Math learning gains went from 48 to 66. The new math series and support from the math department which included anchor charts, powerpoints, and manipulatives supplied for all students to support new standards. Math tutoring for third grade lowest quartile after school. Reflex for all students to support math fluency. Data chats during PLC helped identify strengths and areas of concern, including specific students that required additional support.

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

We had 84 students with attendance below 90%. There were 13 students that scored level 1 on the math FAST state assessment.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention at CCE are:
Math lowest quartile
ELA lowest quartile
SWD
targeted coaching support
attendance
A trend has been identified to provide ongoing coaching and training to support and monitor these systems to ensure there is evidence of implementation and impact.

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 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.

As a result of our data analysis and reflection, it revealed that 52% of our lowest-quartile math students demonstrated proficiency on the math FAST state assessment. Improvement is needed in the area of implementing the new benchmarks and district resources in math through training and coaching.

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

Increase the lowest quartile in math from 52% to 60% on the math FAST state assessment.
Student practice:
After the administration of PM1 and PM2, students in the lowest quartile in math will show growth according to their scale score on the math FAST assessment aligned with the state's growth.
After the administration of the PM3 in May, 60% of the lowest quartile student in math will score a level 2 or higher on the math FAST assessment.
Teacher practice:
By the end of the fourth grading period, 90% of all classroom teachers will provide students will benchmark-aligned instruction using grade-level appropriate district-provided materials as evidenced in walkthroughs.
Coaching practice:
By the end of the fourth grading period, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%.

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

Student practice:
Students' data will be sorted and analyzed after math FAST PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.
After each district common assessment in math is administered teachers, with the support of our coach, will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.
Teacher practice:
Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed.
The administration will meet with the coach to monitor for district-approved benchmark-aligned instruction with task alignment.
Coaching practice:
The administration and coach will meet to analyze coaching data gathered through walkthroughs and make adjustments to coaching support as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Keany (mdkeany@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.)

Recommendation 7. Monitor the progress of students receiving supplemental instruction and other students
who are at risk.

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

Research has shown that assessing the progress of tier 2 and tier 3 students regularly with general outcome measures and curriculum-embedded measures will help close the achievement gap. Also, by monitoring regularly the progress of tier 1 students who perform just above the cutoff score for general outcome measures will ensure they can be promptly moved to tier 2 if they begin to fall behind.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Professional learning through PLC, ERPL, and monitoring on math BEST standards to support organization and intentionality when presenting lessons.

Person Responsible: Mike Keany (mdkeany@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of first quarter and ongoing.

Ensure classroom instruction and student tasks are aligned to BEST practices and district resources through administrative walkthroughs and team collaboration.

Person Responsible: Mike Keany (mdkeany@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of first quarter and ongoing.

At the conclusion of each FAST and district common assessment, the coach will facilitate data chats during PLCs focusing on student progress of the identified lowest quartile group.

Person Responsible: Mike Keany (mdkeany@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of first quarter and ongoing.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Continuing the implementation of the PBIS program will improve student behavior during instruction which will increase instructional time and reduce the total number of written schoolwide referrals.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year our school had 196 referrals, the majority of which were hitting striking and school rule violations in the classroom and cafeteria. Our goal this year is to decrease our number of referrals by 20% overall.

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

The types of offenses, the number of written referrals, and threat assessments will be monitored through Focus. This data will be shared with our school leadership team each month to communicate success and identify areas of concern to support our faculty and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Hemings (smheming@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.)

Research has shown by adopting schoolwide strategies or programs and implementing ones shown to reduce negative and foster positive interactions make an impact on reducing behaviors that warrant written referrals.

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

Classroom teachers, in coordination with other school personnel (such as administrators, grade-level teams, and special educators), can benefit from adopting a schoolwide approach to preventing problem behaviors and
increasing positive social interactions among students and with school staff. This type of systemic approach requires a shared responsibility on the part of all school personnel, particularly the administrators who establish and support consistent schoolwide practices and the teachers who implement these practices both in their individual classrooms and beyond.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Established a new PBIS leadership team with members that will continue to implement a schoolwide PBIS system with refined practices.

Person Responsible: Susan Hemings (smheming@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Team members will be identified during pre-planning

Review and refine behavior expectations for all common areas on campus and communicate them to faculty, staff, and students.

Person Responsible: Susan Hemings (smheming@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: The end of the first quarter and ongoing