

Volusia County Schools

T. Dewitt Taylor Middle High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	0

T. Dewitt Taylor Middle High School

100 E WASHINGTON AVE, Pierson, FL 32180

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/taylor/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Gibbons

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grades History	<p>2018-19: C (50%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (52%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (48%)</p> <p>2015-16: C (45%)</p>
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

T. DeWitt Taylor Middle High School strives to be a community of lifelong learners. We welcome our students, staff, and families to learn together, engaging everyone with challenging academics and a focus on becoming responsible and active citizens in our ever changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The heartbeat of Taylor Middle-High School is working together to achieve academic excellence, self-worth, and multicultural respect through a caring environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pearce, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	Data/ Master Schedule Assistant Principal Jonathan will monitor collect and coordinate school wide data and share school wide data trends with the SLT. Jonathan will also assists in the development and monitoring of the school improvement plan.
Gibbons, Kathy	Principal	School instructional leader As the instructional leader my role on this team to help facilitate and support my school leaders. The efforts of the team are then put into action with my direction and support.
Rubio, Marisol	Assistant Principal	HS Assistant Principal Marisol will work with the graduation assurance team to monitor individual and school wide data to ensure each student has an opportunity to graduate. Marisol will also assist in writing and maintaining the school improvement plan.
LaMondie, Laurie	Assistant Principal	ESE Administrator As the ESE administrator Laurie will monitor all ESE data to work with the team and the district making adjustments when warranted
Fenwick, Bonnie	Math Coach	Math Coach Bonnie will assist the SLT by monitoring school wide data trends of our mathematic team. Working with the district, school administration and teachers she will help make adjustments to improve classroom mathematics instruction.
RAULERSON, JAMIE	Teacher, K-12	AVID Middle School Teacher As the new middle school AVID teacher Jamie will assist the SLT by reviewing and monitoring data for our students who have scored well in state assessment data. Working with the team to look for trends and suggestion for support and acceleration
Davis, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	ESE teacher Jamie will work with the ESE Assistant Principal, ESE teachers school wide and the district personnel to review and monitor ESE data trends. The ESE will implement necessary adjustments as needed.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hutcherson, Kinsey	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Science Teacher Kinsey will work with the Science team school wide and district personnel to monitor and discuss school wide science data trends.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Kathleen Gibbons

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,136

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	146	175	167	184	170	128	1136
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	28	29	29	38	34	37	230
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	29	18	20	11	11	98
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	14	16	32	20	22	116
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	51	82	69	61	50	31	387
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	65	66	76	47	35	25	351
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	39	26	5	3	3	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	49	30	37	31	23	212

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	15	5	2	2	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	5	8	3	31

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	161	144	169	152	114	124	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	7	13	2	6	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	21	20	23	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	46	50	40	35	26	274
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	35	58	49	33	21	23	241
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	24	38	40	30	25	22	191

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	9	1	1	1	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	8	6	2	0	22

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	161	144	169	152	114	124	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	7	13	2	6	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	21	20	23	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	46	50	40	35	26	274
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	35	58	49	33	21	23	241
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	24	38	40	30	25	22	191

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	9	1	1	1	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	8	6	2	0	22

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%			39%	52%	56%	41%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	41%			45%	49%	51%	45%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%			42%	37%	42%	39%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	29%			41%	48%	51%	37%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	31%			45%	49%	48%	48%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%			36%	38%	45%	41%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	54%			54%	76%	68%	57%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	50%			48%	69%	73%	59%	66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	32%	50%	-18%	54%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	34%	47%	-13%	52%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
09	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
10	2021					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	26%	48%	-22%	55%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	34%	47%	-13%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	41%	29%	12%	46%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	48%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	72%	-11%	67%	-6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	42%	68%	-26%	71%	-29%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	63%	-10%	70%	-17%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

FSA ELA Grade 6 thru 10
 FSA Math Grade 6 thru 10
 Biology EOC
 US History EOC
 Science EOC Grade 8
 Civics EOC Grade 7

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	148/20	240/19	128/2
	Economically Disadvantaged	114/18	191/18	105/1
	Students With Disabilities	22/9	53/6	31/0
	English Language Learners	68/13	118/14	64/2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	184/21	239/7	116/21
	Economically Disadvantaged	148/20	192/4	95/17
	Students With Disabilities	43/5	56/7	26/15
	English Language Learners	92/18	117/16	56/14

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	298/19	236/33	154/18
	Economically Disadvantaged	244/17	188/30	125/15
	Students With Disabilities	71/7	45/20	32/0
	English Language Learners	134/14	98/31	66/12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	185/2	151/3	20/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	148/1	118/3	12/0
	Students With Disabilities	36/0	31/0	
	English Language Learners	81/0	58/2	5/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	276/26	287/20	602/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	224/23	234/17	486/19
	Students With Disabilities	61/16	65/12	138/7
	English Language Learners	121/14	123/14	250/13

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	266/25	267/20	140/6
	Economically Disadvantaged	202/23	204/17	110/4
	Students With Disabilities	50/2	53/11	30/0
	English Language Learners	76/9	67/4	38/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	237/11	76/1	120/18
	Economically Disadvantaged	189/10	57/2	95/19
	Students With Disabilities	51/10	1/0	29/10
	English Language Learners	72/11	6/17	34/15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	245/51	227/39	276/52
	Economically Disadvantaged	186/46	172/36	209/47
	Students With Disabilities	50/24	41/10	57/30
	English Language Learners	63/33	57/23	73/33

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	131/31	300/38	147/14
	Economically Disadvantaged	96/29	232/34	112/9
	Students With Disabilities	27/7	59/27	29/3
	English Language Learners	29/7	75/29	36/6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	215/3	260/9	215/1
	Economically Disadvantaged	178/2	212/8	176/2
	Students With Disabilities	54/2	59/2	52/0
	English Language Learners	73/1	78/4	70/1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	203/71	143/64	146/77
	Economically Disadvantaged	138/68	96/61	98/76
	Students With Disabilities	12/50	12/25	11/27
	English Language Learners	12/75	8/50	8/75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	2/0	2/0	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	251/17	126/15	268/24
	Economically Disadvantaged	197/18	100/14	213/22
	Students With Disabilities	30/10	16/0	35/6
	English Language Learners	80/8	39/5	87/17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39/0	82/9	50/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/0	56/7	35/0
	Students With Disabilities	2/0	8/0	5/0
	English Language Learners	9/0	17/18	10/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	215/40	169/27	164/51
	Economically Disadvantaged	188/39	149/27	147/50
	Students With Disabilities	33/21	32/16	30/43
	English Language Learners	94/27	75/21	73/52
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	2/0	6/17	4/25
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/0	6/17	4/25
	Students With Disabilities	2/0	3/0	2/0
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/34	67/21	3/33
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/32	55/15	3/33
	Students With Disabilities	13/23	13/23	2/-
	English Language Learners	25/20	25/0	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31/6	69/9	42/2
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/7	60/10	37/3
	Students With Disabilities	5/20	13/0	8/0
	English Language Learners	17/12	32/34	22/5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	1/0	1/0	2/0
	Economically Disadvantaged		1/0	2/0
	Students With Disabilities		1/0	2/0
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	181/76	259/69	168/65
	Economically Disadvantaged	141/75	202/67	127/65
	Students With Disabilities	28/50	38/55	24/42
	English Language Learners	58/55	86/43	57/60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/54	85/58	
	Economically Disadvantaged	63/52	65/58	
	Students With Disabilities	12/58	12/50	
	English Language Learners	28/46	29/48	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/0	24/0	18/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/0	18/0	14/0
	Students With Disabilities	3/0	7/0	6/0
	English Language Learners	9/0	14/0	11/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	2/100	3/100	2/100
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/100	3/100	2/100
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	8	21	20	10	28	32	31	33		84	12
ELL	17	30	28	22	26	30	29	32		90	11
BLK	27	45		17	45						
HSP	30	38	32	28	30	30	48	45	77	86	31
WHT	45	47	32	33	35	42	67	60	76	91	45

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
FRL	30	38	32	27	30	32	52	44	76	86	35
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	14	38	40	18	37	29	26	17		90	11
ELL	13	34	41	22	34	40	25	26	46	71	24
BLK	24	48		13	8						
HSP	33	43	41	36	43	39	49	42	71	85	35
WHT	51	50	41	52	52	27	67	59	68	87	60
FRL	35	44	43	37	42	35	51	43	69	85	33
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	40	35	14	29	31	16	37		81	29
ELL	9	32	38	15	39	38	19	35			
BLK	16	17		19	45						
HSP	35	44	40	33	47	42	51	54	75	79	48
WHT	53	48	41	46	48	39	68	69	76	85	43
FRL	36	44	39	33	46	41	54	55	72	80	42

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Math is trending downward:

- * math achievement: 2019 - 41%, 2021 - 29%
- * math learning gains: 2019 - 45%, 2021 - 31%
- * math LQ Learning Gains: 2019 - 36%, 2021 - 33%
- * SWD: 2019 - 35% 2021 - 19%

Civics EoC scores are trending downward:

- * 2018 - 54%, 2019 - 42%, 2021 - 39%

8th Grade Science -- was trending up, but then had a significant drop:

- * 2018 - 46%, 2019 - 48%, 2021 - 39%

ELA Achievement trending downward:

- * Achievement: 2019 - 39%, 2021 - 35
- * Learning Gains: 2019 - 45%, 2021 - 41
- * LQ Learning Gains: 2019 - 42%, 2021 - 33%
- * SWD: 2019 - 39%, 2021 - 27%

Graduation Rate, MS Acceleration are trending upward

US History EoC trending upward:

- * 2019 - 53%, 2021 - 56%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

High School College & Career Readiness: 2019 - 43%, 2021 - 36%
 Math Learning Gains: 2019 - 45%, 2021 - 31%

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors for improvement: Classroom management, COVID (quarantine), Attendance, Drop in scores
New actions: continue CHAMPS training, SEL counselor, impact lab, MS and HS PASS teachers

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

MS Acceleration: 2019 - 58%, 2021 - 78%

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Reviewing student placement. Increasing students in Honors and HS classes.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Awareness. Early identification and monitoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Training for teachers on EWS analysis; Training for teachers understanding assessment data mining; training on AVID strategies; CHAMPS; Project-based Learning; how to support math across the curriculum

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

On campus SEL counselor. Both MS and HS PASS teacher.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A large portion of our population have been identified deficient in 2 or more indicators that meet EWS criteria.
* 212 students across grade 6-12 with two or more EWS indicators

Measureable Outcome: 1. Reduce the average number of days absent by 25%.
2. Reduce the course failure rate quarterly by 25%.

Monitoring: The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly Graduation Assurance PLC meetings for attendance and course progression. Course failures will be monitored through curriculum PLC meetings using data mining of assessment data, both classroom and district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy we will use is PLCs. Studies indicate that when PLCs work they not only increase student achievement, but also improve teacher morale. Middle school teachers divided into grade level PLCs. High school teachers divided into curriculum PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Be aware of any trends, gaps that would inform instruction and allow teachers to make instructional adjustments.
Data analysis provides real-time information on student progress.
District content specialist invited to PLCs for training on data mining, lesson modeling, best practices
Data analysis - use of Power BI, EWS report, school-city, DIAs, SMTs VLTs.
PLCs work in schools when they have:
a solid mission, collaborative teams that work interdependently to achieve shared goals, a results-oriented focus, and a commitment to continuous improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

SLT will review/discuss EWS report on monthly basis.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC's will review/discuss EWS report.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SLT and PLC agenda topic and minutes.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring and follow-up of impact lab.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly attendance meetings.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Parent teacher conferences.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our EWS data, students are not actively engaged in the classroom. As evidenced by 98 course failures in ELA with 387 students at a level 1 achievement on FSA ELA.

Measureable Outcome: Increase percentage of students proficient on FSA ELA assessment from 35% to 50%

Monitoring: The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly Graduation Assurance PLC meetings for attendance and course progression. Course failures will be monitored through curriculum PLC meetings using data mining of assessment data, both classroom and district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy we will use is PLCs. Studies indicate that when PLCs work they not only increase student achievement, but also improve teacher morale. Middle school teachers divided into grade level PLCs. High school teachers divided into curriculum PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Be aware of any trends, gaps that would inform instruction and allow teachers to make instructional adjustments.
Data analysis provides real-time information on student progress.
District content specialist invited to PLCs for training on data mining, lesson modeling, best practices
Data analysis - use of Power BI, EWS report, school-city, DIAs, SMTs VLTs.
PLCs work in schools when they have:
a solid mission, collaborative teams that work interdependently to achieve shared goals, a results-oriented focus, and a commitment to continuous improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

SLT will review/discuss EWS report on monthly basis.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC's will review/discuss EWS report and district assessments.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SLT and PLC agenda topic and minutes.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring and follow-up of impact lab.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly attendance meetings.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Parent teacher conferences.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our EWS data, students are not actively engaged in the classroom. As evidenced by 116 course failures in math with 351 students at a level 1 achievement on FSA Math.

Measureable Outcome: Increase percentage of students proficient on FSA Math from 29% to 50%

Monitoring: The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly Graduation Assurance PLC meetings for attendance and course progression. Course failures will be monitored through curriculum PLC meetings using data mining of assessment data, both classroom and district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy we will use is PLCs. Studies indicate that when PLCs work they not only increase student achievement, but also improve teacher morale. Middle school teachers divided into grade level PLCs. High school teachers divided into curriculum PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Be aware of any trends, gaps that would inform instruction and allow teachers to make instructional adjustments.
Data analysis provides real-time information on student progress.
District content specialist invited to PLCs for training on data mining, lesson modeling, best practices
Data analysis - use of Power BI, EWS report, school-city, DIAs, SMTs VLTs.
PLCs work in schools when they have:
a solid mission, collaborative teams that work interdependently to achieve shared goals, a results-oriented focus, and a commitment to continuous improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

SLT will review/discuss EWS report on monthly basis.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC's will review/discuss EWS report and district assessments.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SLT and PLC agenda topic and minutes.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring and follow-up of impact lab.

Person Responsible Jonathan Pearce (jpearce@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly attendance meetings

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Parent teacher conferences.

Person Responsible Marisol Rubio (mrubio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on data we are showing marked improvement since 2018 with a significant decrease in student suspensions and incidents. In 2018 we had 99 total incidents averaging 8.6 incidents per 100 students; in 2019 we decreased to 43 total incidents averaging 3.8 incidents per 100 students. This is still above the state average of 3.3 incidents per 100 students. We decreased our suspension from 28.3/100 students in 2018 to 12.6/100 students in 2019. Our goal is to continue this trend.

Our primary concern is violent incidents. Even though we are seeing a marked decrease, we are still ranked Very High due to the number of Fight incidents. However, we believe this is due to a reporting issue with our SIS System (Focus) where each student involved in a fight is generating separating incidents, i.e. two students get into a fight, in Focus two SESIR incidents are created instead of one incident citing both students. We plan to schedule professional development from the district on how to properly report incidents in Focus.

Our secondary concern is prevention of incidents. We have added a Teacher of Assignment to address SEL concerns to be proactive in preventing incidents before they occur. SESIR data is reviewed monthly by administration team to monitor number of incidents.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Parental involvement activities, such as orientation activities, financial aid night, registration night, awards celebrations and other events related to core instructional areas, provide workshop opportunities for families to receive free materials and gain strategies for increasing skills in reading and math. Additional events are scheduled to involve parents in assisting students with decisions regarding dual enrollment and advanced placement learning opportunities. Parents have access to school counselors at these events for academic

feedback and collaborative strategy dialogue. Stakeholders are also on hand to provide assistance for academic success for students enrolled in programs, such as ESOL and ESE. The campus is opened for families regularly after school to provide access for technology, Gradebook access, and research. A large percentage of parents are Spanish speakers. As a result, all school sponsored activities include translation services from English to Spanish, in order to achieve effective communication.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers promote a positive culture by having parent conferences for individual students to address and offer strategies for their academic achievement .

Counselors guide students in achieving their personal goals alongside their parents.

Administration support and facilitate remediation and acceleration opportunities and always include celebrations.

School Advisory Council (SAC) annually reviews climate survey data to make recommendations for school improvement. And meets monthly to discuss and review all aspects of school life.