
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

New Smyrna Beach High School

1015 10TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://www.nsbhigh.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.

Working together with parents, school personnel and community members, New Smyrna Beach High School students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be positive contributors to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

If NSBHS implements social and academic supports for equitable, ambitious standards-based learning through collective efficacy, then students' at-risk factors will decrease, and academic achievement will increase.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Merrick, Timothy | Principal | As principal, Mr. Merrick oversees the daily activities and operations within our school. As the face of our school he ensures the school environment is safe for all students and staff members. |
| Everidge, Erin | Assistant Principal | Assists the Principal in the administration and supervision of the high school and may exercise such authority in the absence of the Principal. Leads efforts to monitor, evaluate, and expand curriculum with the academic departments. |
| Eschen, Brian | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal that oversees school-based safety and security, and addresses school's daily discipline incidents and consequences. He also assists the athletic director with administrative needs, coordinate school staff's facilities needs, and provides feedback to teachers as an Instructional leader. |
| Hughes, Gabriele | Math Coach | Math coach that provides instructional support, professional development, data review, model lessons, support curriculum planning and provide/ recommend resources to teachers. |
| Lavender, Casey | Instructional Coach | Academic coach that provides professional learning and support for teachers in implementing effective instruction that will enhance learning opportunities for all students in Volusia County Schools. |
| Hinton-Manson, Charlea | Teacher, K-12 | Science department chair who teaches AICE Marine Science and Biology |
| McDonald, Nicole | Instructional Media | Design, conduct, and evaluate learning activities that teach information literacy; build and manage collections that include diverse formats; organize, establish and supervise routines and procedures for efficient operation of the media center. |
| Scrivano, John | Teacher, K-12 | ELA department chair who teaches AICE English Literature and English 4 |
| Zona, Susan | Other | Cambridge AICE Coordinator - Coordinates Cambridge program, which includes course progression, student achievement monitoring, budgeting, and testing. Also serves as the SAC chair. |

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.

School leadership team consists of administration, teachers, and coaches who were invited to a summer planning session for the development of the School Improvement Plan. Together the group reviewed data from the 2021-2022 and the 2022-2023 school years to create the two goals for the 2023-2024 school year. The SLT looked at the state assessment data, graduation rate, college and career rate, attendance, discipline, and the ESSA subgroup data. The information will be reviewed by the School Advisory Committee which includes parents, students, 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))

Attendance will be reviewed by the attendance clerk and assistant principal. The athletic attendance policy will also be monitored by the athletic director. The EWS will be monitored by the MTSS team. Student progress will be monitored regularly by district and state assessments. Administration and Coaches will conduct walkthroughs.

Data will be shared and discussed during weekly coaches meetings, administrator meetings, and monthly SLT meetings. The data will also be shared at the monthly SAC meeting.

Any increase in truancy, decrease in progress monitoring assessments, and any feedback from teachers will drive adjustments to the SIP.

| Demographic Data | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Other School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 19% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 75% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | 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) | |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B 2020-21: B |

| | |
|--|------------|
| | 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 | 0 | 572 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 445 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| 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 | 58 |

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 | 467 |

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 | 73 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 51 | | | 53 | | | 51 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46 | | | 52 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 37 | | | 40 | | | 41 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 38 | | | 35 | | | 49 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | 44 | | | 35 | | | 53 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45 | | | 29 | | | 36 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 75 | | | 82 | | | 84 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 67 | | | 69 | | | 76 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 96 | | | 93 | | | 76 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 78 | | | 47 | | | 52 | | |
| ELP Progress | | | | | | | | | |

* 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 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 577 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | 96 |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 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 | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | | | |
| HSP | 69 | | | |
| MUL | 47 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

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)

| 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 | 51 | 46 | 37 | 38 | 44 | 45 | 75 | 67 | | 96 | 78 | |
| SWD | 19 | 30 | 26 | 19 | 37 | 41 | 32 | 31 | | 92 | 62 | |

| 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 |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 38 | 38 | 36 | 54 | | 63 | 41 | | 100 | 63 | |
| HSP | 60 | 56 | 55 | 53 | 54 | | 78 | 74 | | 94 | 94 | |
| MUL | 44 | 36 | 9 | 15 | 30 | | 56 | 62 | | 94 | 73 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 46 | 37 | 39 | 44 | 43 | 76 | 69 | | 96 | 79 | |
| FRL | 40 | 39 | 33 | 31 | 38 | 42 | 66 | 57 | | 94 | 76 | |

| 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 | 53 | 52 | 40 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 82 | 69 | | 93 | 47 | |
| SWD | 16 | 40 | 40 | 17 | 29 | 27 | 58 | 45 | | 92 | 9 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 40 | 41 | 17 | 33 | 27 | 62 | 55 | | 97 | 17 | |
| HSP | 55 | 60 | | 39 | 21 | | 82 | 54 | | 96 | 23 | |
| MUL | 31 | 31 | 42 | 23 | 40 | | 60 | 69 | | 85 | 47 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 53 | 40 | 37 | 36 | 31 | 85 | 71 | | 93 | 52 | |
| FRL | 45 | 51 | 40 | 28 | 31 | 26 | 77 | 64 | | 89 | 35 | |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 51 | 48 | 41 | 49 | 53 | 36 | 84 | 76 | | 76 | 52 | |
| SWD | 19 | 42 | 41 | 24 | 59 | 47 | 63 | 46 | | 61 | 7 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 23 | 30 | 31 | 29 | 55 | 50 | 60 | 44 | | 77 | 25 | |
| HSP | 39 | 45 | 25 | 32 | 42 | | 80 | 61 | | 75 | 67 | |
| MUL | 57 | 62 | | 69 | 36 | | 100 | 90 | | 81 | 44 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 50 | 45 | 52 | 55 | 33 | 86 | 80 | | 75 | 54 | |
| FRL | 42 | 43 | 41 | 43 | 50 | 36 | 77 | 70 | | 68 | 40 | |

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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 showed the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year. Contributing factors to the low performance including staffing issues (extended absence), our community experienced two devastating hurricanes that caused loss of instructional time for both staff and students, and our district adopted new math resources and the state adopted new standards the same year so curriculum maps and pacing were not aligned.

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

Math showed the greatest decline for the 2022-2023 school year. Contributing factors to the low performance including staffing issues (extended absence), our community experienced two devastating hurricanes that caused loss of instructional time for both staff and students, and our district adopted new math resources and the state adopted new standards the same year so curriculum maps and pacing were not aligned.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The only gap that was noticeable was in Math. The current state average data also includes the middle school scores. In addition, staffing issues (extended absence), loss of instructional time due to hurricanes, new resources, and pacing also contributed to the gap.

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

The components that showed the most improvement were attendance and discipline. PBIS incentives, lunch pass revocation, increasing home visits, and athlete attendance contracts all impacted the improvement in attendance and decrease in discipline.

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

1. Math - In the 2021-2022 school year, 38% of our students demonstrated proficiency; however in 2022-2023 school year that number dropped to 29%. This component had the largest decline.
2. Attendance - In the 2021-2022 school year, 31% of our students had attendance below 90%. In the 2022-2023 school year, we improved our attendance by 16% through new initiatives and believe we can continue to improve by refining those practices.

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

1. Math
2. Attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our Needs Assessment revealed that only 39% of our Students with Disabilities reached proficiency in the six components.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By February 2024, 44% of SWD will demonstrate proficiency on ELA and Math VBAs. By May 2024, 95% of classroom teachers will provide students standards-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthroughs. Instructional leaders (including coaches and administration) will conduct regular walkthroughs using a school-created document (Four Look-Fors) to be used as a coaching tool, resulting in 95% of the classroom teachers providing standard-aligned tasks.

Monitoring:

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

School leadership team will attend weekly PLC meetings to provide support and feedback to teachers as they are preparing to deliver instruction. Administration and Instructional Coaches will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the delivery of instruction. Leadership team will conduct data chats with teachers throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Everidge (eaeverid@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.)

Questioning Strategies: Using curriculum maps, classroom teachers will use provided questions to reach the depth of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention was chosen based on the data showing that only 39% of SWD met proficiency. The use of embedded questions will ensure students are being asked to meet the depth of the standard and instruction is consistent from classroom to classroom.

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.

Monthly meetings with case managers (SWD - cohort) to discuss students who need interventions for attendance, behavior, and academics.

Person Responsible: Annette Pezza (acpezza@volusia.k12.fl.us)

After the first progress monitoring assessments are administered, teachers, case managers, and coaches will review data to guide instruction. Remediation plans will be implemented.

Person Responsible: Gabriele Hughes (ghughes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#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.

Our Needs Assessment revealed that 30% of our students had attendance below 90%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2022-23 SY, we reduced absences by 16%, therefore by continuing initiatives we began and adding more classroom-based PBIS reinforcements, students absences will improve by 8% by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by our attendance committee. This committee will include attendance chair, MTSS chair, PBIS chair, school social worker, and teachers. The goal of the committee will be to identify students with excessive absences and truant behaviors, develop and implement school-wide procedures to increase attendance. We will involve teachers via PLC's in providing data and feedback to MTSS/PBIS and attendance committees

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Eschen (bpeschen@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is the district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports and Positive Behavior Intervention System.

- All teachers will take accurate attendance each day and report any student concerns or trends to attendance committee
- All teachers will implement MTSS and report any student concerns or trends to MTSS Chair
- All teachers will implement PBIS and report any student concerns or trends to PBIS Chair
- 5, 10, 15 day attendance letters
- Monthly meetings with Social Worker
- Continue athletic attendance policy

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS and PBIS are grounded in careful analysis of data collected through progress monitoring and data-based decision making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS and PBIS is not a "wait to fail" model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity. Schools will be provided with essential training in MTSS and PBIS and its strategies to support student learning.

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.

Weekly PLC discussions and reporting of attendance, behavior, and academic concerns to the attendance/MTSS/PBIS committees. Each committee will monitor the data and implement strategies and interventions to develop plan of action.

Person Responsible: Brian Eschen (bpeschen@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Mid year review of data including EWS indicators, successful MTSS/PBIS strategies and interventions, and committee updates

Person Responsible: Brian Eschen (bpeschen@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly meetings with case managers (SWD - cohort) to discuss students who need interventions for attendance, behavior, and academics. Concentration will be on attendance

Person Responsible: Annette Pezza (acpezza@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue the implementation of the athlete attendance policy

Person Responsible: Gerald Fuller (gafuller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a student PBIS committee to provide input on the school-wide PBIS initiatives

Person Responsible: Brian Eschen (bpeschen@volusia.k12.fl.us)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School improvement funds are provided to the teachers upon approval of the School Advisory Council. Teachers must submit request that is aligned to our school improvement goals and must present the proposal to SAC who awards funding based on needs. In addition, we will implement ARP Supplemental Programming Grant Assurances to provide tutoring and incentives to students.

We have allocated teaching units to address level 1 & 2 Math and Reading students.