Spirit Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Laura Figueroa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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.

Table of Contents

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

We will stimulate the potential of ALL through high expectations and a positive SPIRIT of learning from which our students will emerge as responsible, productive citizens of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spirit's the place where every student shines!

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
Devaney, Carrie Ann	Principal	
Robinson, Jamie	Assistant Principal	
Elliott, Stefanie	Teacher, K-12	
GAETJENS, MICHELLE	Instructional Media	
TUFARIELLO, DARLENE	Instructional Coach	
Richards, Carol	Instructional Coach	
Morales-Torres, Nitza	Teacher, K-12	
French, Laura	Teacher, ESE	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	99	105	97	129	108	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	8	18	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	20	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - 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	
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	7	14	10	14	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	5	6	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	20	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	1	2	2	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	46%	56%	57%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	53%	52%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	59%	63%	47%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	56%	62%	38%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	57%	53%	48%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	99 (0)	105 (0)	97 (0)	129 (0)	108 (0)	119 (0)	657 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 (0)	13 (0)	8 (0)	18 (0)	20 (0)	21 (0)	102 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	28 (0)	20 (0)	52 (0)	100 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	59%	-18%	64%	-23%
	2018	48%	60%	-12%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	56%	-10%	53%	-7%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	25	40	29	31	59	50	29				
ELL	38	56	46	40	54	32	33				
BLK	32	32	23	40	56	42	26				
HSP	44	54	43	43	50	25	37				
WHT	50	52	27	53	60	50	64				
FRL	44	48	37	47	56	37	47				
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	27	43	42	31	51	38	40				
ELL	32	33	29	33	52	36	35				
BLK	43	44	58	38	56	45	42				
HSP	39	43	35	36	53	41	43				
WHT	57	51	53	64	68	39	71				
FRL	44	47	44	46	58	40	51				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	39	43	18	21	19	24				
ELL	41	51	42	38	47	33	16				
ASN	64			73							
BLK	37	63		31	37		50				
HSP	53	54	46	42	37	38	49				
WHT	62	63	52	54	38	32	45				
FRL	51	59	53	43	40	38	45				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 4th grade ELA proficiency. Contributing factors include the 3rd grade cohort of students from the 17-18 school year with 40% proficiency coming into the grade level. All 3rd grade students were promoted to 4th grade and, higher percentage of 3rd grade transition students working to complete portfolio throughout the 18-19 school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year 4th grade ELA proficiency with a 12 percent decline from the 4th grade students from the 17-18 school year. Contributing factors include the 3rd grade cohort of students from the 17-18 school year with 40% proficiency coming into the grade level. All 3rd grade students were promoted to 4th grade and, higher percentage of 3rd grade transition students working to complete portfolio throughout the 18-19 school year; Change in core curriculum resources.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th grade Math proficiency. The 18-19 4th grade Math proficiency was 41% which is 23% less than the state percentage. Contributing factors include the 3rd grade cohort of students from 17-18 school year with 41% proficiency coming into the grade level. All 3rd grade students were promoted to 4th grade, these students came into the grade level with more academic deficits. This cohort had a large number of students who scored a Level 1 or Level 2 that needed to make more than 20 point learning gains to reach a proficient score.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores. The 17-18 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores were 40%, the 18-19 ELA proficiency scores were 48%; this grade to grade comparison shows an 8% gain. Contributing factors include standards aligned instruction, all teachers meeting regularly with students for ELA small group and, using the FSA achievement level descriptor document to guide assessment questions.

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

Two potential areas of concerns for the upcoming school year include the 19-20 5th grade ELA proficiency scores. The 4th grade cohort of students scored 36% for the 18-19 school year. Another potential area of concern includes ELA proficiency, and learning gains for our SWD subgroup. This subgroup declined in all categories (ELA proficiency, ELA learning gains, ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile) for the 18-19 school year.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Science proficiency
4. ELA learning gains for SWD subgroup
5. ELA and Math learning gains for African American subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA proficiency
Rationale	ELA proficiency for the 18-19 school year was 46% which is 2% lower than the ELA proficiency for the previous school year which was 48%. The decline in ELA proficiency is how the SLT identified ELA proficiency as an area of focus. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success because if all teachers are provided professional development in best practices for ELA instruction and how to analyze data to drive instruction, then student proficiency will increase for the 19-20 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA proficiency will increase by 9% for the upcoming school year. ELA proficiency will increase from 46% from the 18-19 school year to 55% for the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Refine systemic practices by increasing awareness of instructional strategies through coaching, modeling, sharing, and providing professional learning to support implementation of standards- aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Expand teacher use of best practices to increase the percentage of teachers effectively implementing standards-aligned instruction. Implementation of standards-aligned instruction will increase student achievement and foster collective efficacy among faculty and staff.
Action Step	
Description	1.Develop plan of action for professional learning and systemic practices including the infrastructure for implementation. 2.Communicate plan to refine systemic practices to support implementation of standards-aligned instruction, collect teacher input and revise if necessary. 3.Teacher participation in district content sessions supporting standards-aligned instruction during pre-planning week and throughout the school year during school based professional development, and district provided professional development.
Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math proficiency
Rationale	Math proficiency for the 18-19 school year was 49% which is the same proficiency percentage as the Math proficiency for the previous school year. The SLT identified Math proficiency as an area of focus due to the proficiency percentage remaining unchanged for the past 2 years. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success because if all teachers are provided professional development in best practices for Math instruction and how to analyze data to drive instruction, then student proficiency will increase for the 19-20 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math proficiency will increase by 6% for the upcoming school year. Math proficiency will increase from 49% from the 18-19 school year to 55% for the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Refine systemic practices by increasing awareness of instructional strategies through coaching, modeling, sharing, and providing professional learning to support implementation of standards- aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Expand teacher use of best practices to increase the percentage of teachers effectively implementing standards-aligned instruction. Implementation of standards-aligned instruction will increase student achievement and foster collective efficacy among faculty and staff.
Action Step	
Description	1.Develop plan of action for professional learning and systemic practices including the infrastructure for implementation. 2.Communicate plan to refine systemic practices to support implementation of standards-aligned instruction, collect teacher input and revise if necessary. 3.Teacher participation in district content sessions supporting standards-aligned instruction during pre-planning week and throughout the school year during school based professional development, and district provided professional development.
Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science proficiency
Rationale	Science proficiency for the 18-19 school year was 49% which is 7% lower than the Science proficiency for the previous school year which was 56%. The decline in Science proficiency is how the SLT identified Science proficiency as an area of focus. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success because if all teachers are provided professional development in best practices for Science instruction and how to analyze data to drive instruction, then student proficiency will increase for the 19-20 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science proficiency will increase by 13% for the upcoming school year. Science proficiency will increase from 49% from the 18-19 school year to 62% for the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Refine systemic practices by increasing awareness of instructional strategies through coaching, modeling, sharing, and providing professional learning to support implementation of standards- aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Expand teacher use of best practices to increase the percentage of teachers effectively implementing standards-aligned instruction. Implementation of standards-aligned instruction will increase student achievement and foster collective efficacy among faculty and staff.
Action Step	
Description	1.Develop plan of action for professional learning and systemic practices including the infrastructure for implementation. 2.Communicate plan to refine systemic practices to support implementation of standards-aligned instruction, collect teacher input and revise if necessary. 3.Teacher participation in district content sessions supporting standards-aligned instruction during pre-planning week and throughout the school year during school based professional development, and district provided professional development.
Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	ELA learning gains for SWD subgroup
Rationale	ELA learning gains for the SWD subgroup for the 18-19 school year was 40% which is 3% lower than the ELA learning gains for the SWD subgroup for the previous school year which was 43%. The decline in ELA learning gains is how the SLT identified ELA learning gains as an area of focus. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success because if all teachers are provided professional development in best practices for ELA instruction and how to analyze data to drive instruction, then student learning gains will increase for the 19-20 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA learning gains for SWD subgroup will increase by 10% for the upcoming school year. ELA learning gains will increase from 40% from the 18-19 school year to 50% for the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Refine PLCs that follow an intentional cycle to improve knowledge and use of technology to support the implementation of standards-aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PLC cycles ensure all student needs are met, strengthen teacher collaboration and support instructional practice as well as increasing student engagement and providing skills for 21st Century learning.
Action Step	
Description	1.We will establish quality norms and adhere to the norms consistently so that we can maintain focus on curriculum content. 2.Provide training on effective PLCs. 3.Establish shared teams notebook for community resources and communication between grade levels, leadership team and administration. 4.Provide training on differentiation strategies to meet the needs of SWD subgroup. 5.Train teachers to use PLC time to evaluate data an develop instructional groupings and interventions. 6.Train teachers to use PLC time to evaluate SWD subgroup data. 7.Provide teachers and grade levels time for standards alignment and assessment building.
Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#5	
Title	ELA and Math learning gains for African American subgroup
Rationale	ELA learning gains for the African American subgroup for the 18-19 school year was 32% which is 12% lower than the ELA learning gains for the African American subgroup for the previous school year which was 44%. The Math learning gains for the African American subgroup for the 18-19 school year was 42% which was 3% lower than the Math learning gains percentage for the African American subgroup for the previous school year which was 45%. The decline in ELA and Math learning gains is how the SLT identified ELA and math learning gains as an area of focus. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success because if all teachers are provided professional development in best practices for ELA and Math instruction and how to analyze data to drive instruction, then student learning gains will increase for the 19-20 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA learning gains for African American subgroup will increase by 10% for the upcoming school year. ELA learning gains will increase from 32% from the 18-19 school year to 42% for the 19-20 school year. Math learning gains for African American subgroup with increase by 10% for the upcoming school year. Math lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 42% from the 18-19 school year to 52% for the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Refine PLCs that follow an intentional cycle to improve knowledge and use of technology to support the implementation of standards-aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PLC cycles ensure all student needs are met, strengthen teacher collaboration and support instructional practice as well as increasing student engagement and providing skills for 21st Century learning.

Action Step	
Description	1.We will establish quality norms and adhere to the norms consistently so that we can maintain focus on curriculum content. 2.Provide training on effective PLCs. 3.Establish shared teams notebook for community resources and communication between grade levels, leadership team and administration. 4.Provide training on differentiation strategies to meet the needs of African American subgroup. 5.Train teachers to use PLC time to evaluate data an develop instructional groupings and interventions. 6.Train teachers to use PLC time to evaluate African American subgroup data. 7.Provide teachers and grade levels time for standards alignment and assessment building.
Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Meet the objectives/components as outlined by the 5 STAR program.
See PIP for other objectives.

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.

The school offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:
1. Crisis Training Program
2. Sanford Harmony
3. Second Step
4. Children Home Society Visit
All students are screened quarterly for behavioral and social-emotional issues through the electronic report card. Through the screening, the school is able to desegregate data to determine if individual students, classrooms, teachers, grade levels or school would benefit from targeted interventions to address specific behavioral and social-emotional areas. Student service personnel (i.e. school psychologists, school counselors and school social workers) provide direct and indirect evidencebased support to students identified through measure.

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

The District, in conjunction with the local Head Start agency, Early Learning Coalition, VPK Sites and other local pre-school facilities, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families. These include:
•Providing the opportunity for ongoing communication between agencies to facilitate coordination of programs and shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.
•Collaborating and participating in joint professional development, including transition-related training for school staff and pre-school staff when feasible.
•Utilizing pre-school assessments to monitor readiness skills for students transitioning from pre-school to kindergarten.
•Providing to the pre-school agencies local public school policies, kindergarten registration, kindergarten orientation and other relevant information to ease the transition of children and families.
Spirit provides separate activities for parents of incoming Kindergarten students such as their own Open House Night. Out going 5th graders are given information about the school they will be attending. The parents are encouraged to discuss the transition to 6th grade with teacher supported information. The

school sponsors career week for all students.
Articulation meetings are held at the end of the year with our feeder middle schools to plan for our 5th graders entering middle schools.

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.

Personnel: This leadership team reviews student progress data, develops interventions and remediation strategies, monitors instructional support, provides professional development, and celebrates student success. These leaders work with teachers throughout the year to ensure student learning.

Instructional: resources include staff development provided by our district and our school's leadership team. Departments meet with teachers weekly in PLC meetings to collaborate on curriculum planning and share instructional strategies. Our district and our school are both committed to meeting the needs of our students and maximizing our students' achievement.

Methodology for coordinating and supplementing funds: Federal and state funds (Title 1, Title II, SAI and FEFP) are allocated to schools by the district according to student needs as demonstrated by poverty level and student achievement performances. District and school leadership teams work together to coordinate and integrate federal, state and local funds, services and programs for the benefit of students.

Problem solving Activities:
The School Improvement Plan is based on strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the leadership team and are matched to the needs of the the students and school.)

The School improvement funds will be used for providing teachers extended before/after school time to meet in PLCs for planning and data analysis, as well as professional development opportunities; procuring technology for classroom use, and implementing Lesson Study (providing substitute teachers for PLC members who come out of the classroom to participate).

Methodology for coordinating and supplementing funds: Federal and state funds (Title I, Title II, SAI, and FEFP) are allocated to schools by the district according to student need as demonstrated by poverty level and student achievement performance. District and school leadership teams work together to coordinate and integrate federal, state, and local funds, services and programs for the benefit of students.

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

Annual "One Book One School" event where we have community members, volunteers, and business partners come on campus for a couple hours and read the same chapter book to all students at our school. This allows our business partners and community members to visit our classrooms, and communicate with classroom teachers and students to build relationships and lasting connections.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA proficiency	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math proficiency	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science proficiency	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA learning gains for SWD subgroup	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA and Math learning gains for African American subgroup	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**