

Volusia County Schools

# Silver Sands Middle School



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Amanda Wiles**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: A
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: A 2016-17: B 2015-16: C 2014-15: A 2013-14: C
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	

<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

Silver Sands is committed to building individual character and achievement by linking learning to life through real world applications.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Silver Sands Middle School follows the vision statement of Volusia County Schools. Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wiles, Amanda	Principal	Oversee professional development and monitoring of data
Carignan, Tim	Dean	Discipline
Lecras, Timothy	Teacher, K-12	7th Grade Social Studies
Jones, Jessica	Instructional Media	Development of School Improvement Plan
Mitchell, LaTonya	Assistant Principal	Overseeing professional development and monitoring of data
Leathead, Todd	Assistant Principal	Overseeing professional development and monitoring of data

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

**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	499	426	419	0	0	0	0	1344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	69	65	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	9	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	104	112	0	0	0	0	348

**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	41	37	34	0	0	0	0	112

**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	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

76

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/16/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	54	62	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	79	64	0	0	0	0	197
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	9	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	104	112	0	0	0	0	348

**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	65	57	57	0	0	0	0	179

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	51%	54%	58%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	51%	54%	58%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	47%	48%	43%	47%
Math Achievement	66%	54%	58%	62%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%	51%	57%	60%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	42%	51%	49%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	58%	51%	67%	61%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	71%	72%	74%	69%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	499 (0)	426 (0)	419 (0)	1344 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	61 ( )	69 ( )	65 ( )	195 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	16 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (0)	10 (0)	9 (0)	42 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	132 (0)	104 (0)	112 (0)	348 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

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

NOTE: 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.

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	56%	50%	6%	54%	2%
	2018	56%	48%	8%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	47%	7%	52%	2%
	2018	56%	47%	9%	51%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
	2018	59%	49%	10%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	47%	16%	54%	9%
	2018	57%	44%	13%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	45%	29%	16%	46%	-1%
	2018	45%	37%	8%	45%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	63%	57%	6%	48%	15%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	50%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					



<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	79%	68%	11%	71%	8%
2018	74%	66%	8%	71%	3%
Compare		5%			
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%
2018	89%	57%	32%	62%	27%
Compare		7%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%
2018	97%	55%	42%	56%	41%
Compare		3%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	22	40	38	30	42	36	30	51	29		
ELL	27	50	47	47	59	63	20	80			
ASN	71	65		88	63			100	100		
BLK	37	48	51	46	50	43	33	67	89		
HSP	53	56	50	59	66	65	59	68	79		
MUL	52	54	38	55	49	50	69	77	82		
WHT	62	57	48	70	58	54	70	84	80		
FRL	50	51	40	60	54	51	58	74	76		

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	21	45	44	35	54	44	33	54			
ELL	20	35	27	20	42	40					
ASN	85	82		88	81		100		93		
BLK	41	58	56	42	53	46	40	61	84		

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
HSP	55	59	52	48	49	38	55	64	73		
MUL	60	50	38	60	57	23	84	69	89		
WHT	60	57	45	66	62	55	71	78	76		
FRL	52	55	46	55	59	48	60	70	70		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

**ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	618
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data****Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Asian Students**

Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Black/African American Students**

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends**

Proficiency of students with disabilities in Math and ELA. Two ESE teachers quit in October and students were with permanent substitutes for the remainder of the year. This led to a deficiency in our core math and ELA standards.

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

Our Asian population's proficiency in ELA decreased by 14%. However the average was still a 71. This is due to a decrease in our Asian population.

**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 state science average increased by 1% while ours decreased by 2%. This shows a gap in our science achievement. Teachers were adhering to the suggested rigor level within each standard.

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

Social Studies showed a growth of 7% from the previous year. Students who were not proficient were identified based on district scores and participated in a remediation course.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance

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

1. 8th grade Science achievement
2. Students with a disability proficiency in Math
3. Students with a disability proficiency in ELA
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Students proficiency for SWD
<b>Rationale</b>	Less than 1/3 of students with disabilities are proficient
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teacher to student feedback
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	According to John Hattie (Visible Learning for Teachers), If students receive direct feedback on their writing they will become more successful in their abilities as well as self evaluation.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professional development - ELA PLC - effective feedback in writing</li> <li>2. Have teachers review info and develop action plan with Academic Coach/district curriculum specialist</li> <li>3. Plan needs for each grade level</li> <li>4. Have teachers implement</li> <li>5. Monitor through walk throughs</li> <li>6. Review results every 2 weeks in PLC meetings</li> <li>7. Adjust as needed</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Silver Sands science proficiency decreased by 2% while the state average increased 1%.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Science achievement increases from 59% to 65%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data chats
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	According to John Hattie, students will succeed with "targeted learning." Targeting learning occurs when teachers know where the lesson is going and ensure that the students know as well.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify students and share with teacher</li> <li>2. Professional development on Learning Targets and Success Criteria</li> <li>3. Identify standards students are not proficient in</li> <li>4. Professional development - data chats</li> <li>5. Professional development - feedback</li> <li>6. Introduce students to plan</li> <li>7. Administrators will monitor biweekly in PLC's.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Proficiency for SWD
<b>Rationale</b>	Only 34% were proficient
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	40% of students with a disability will be proficient in math
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teacher Clarity
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	According to John Hattie, students will succeed with "targeted learning." Targeting learning occurs when teachers know where the lesson is going and ensure that the students know as well.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify students and share with teachers</li> <li>2. Professional development - learning targets and success criteria</li> <li>3. Identify standards that students are not proficient in</li> <li>4. Implement in classrooms</li> <li>5. Monitor teachers' use of learning targets and success criteris</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amanda Wiles (anwiles@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

**Additional Title I Requirements**  
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

n/a

**PFEP Link**  
 The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

n/a

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

n/a

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

n/a

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

n/a

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Students proficiency for SWD</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Science</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency for SWD</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>