Debary Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Debary Elementary School

88 W HIGHBANKS RD, Debary, FL 32713

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

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Gotlib J

Start Date for this Principal: 1/30/2012

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (74%)
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, 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.

Table of Contents

Debary Elementary School

88 W HIGHBANKS RD, Debary, FL 32713

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/debary/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	No	44%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	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 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.

Our school community will provide a solid foundation for academic and social growth, promoting life-long learners and positive contributors to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

By working together as a team of parents, faculty, staff, community members, and students, we will ensure the continued success of our children.

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
Fedigan, Alisa	Principal	
Miller, Chad	Assistant Principal	
Litwiniec, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Nicole, Strocchia	SAC Member	
baylor, jennifer	Teacher, ESE	
Holloway, Danielle	Instructional Coach	
MARCUS, VALERIE	Teacher, K-12	

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	143	126	126	134	132	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	801
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	8	7	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
	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	1	1	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	9	4	8	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
50

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/17/2019

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	11	9	6	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	1	5	6	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	1	1	1	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	66%	56%	57%	65%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	62%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	46%	53%	54%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	59%	63%	75%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	56%	62%	72%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	43%	51%	57%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	57%	53%	78%	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	143 (0)	126 (0)	126 (0)	134 (0)	132 (0)	140 (0)	801 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 ()	8 ()	8 ()	7 ()	7 ()	12 ()	57 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	11 (0)	19 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	22 (0)	29 (0)	52 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	65%	51%	14%	55%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
	2018	73%	58%	15%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
	2018	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	84%	54%	30%	60%	24%
	2018	78%	57%	21%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	24	39	41	36	47	39	41				
ELL	64			73							
BLK	50	77		72	77						
HSP	60	64		70	76		60				
MUL	59	80		59	70						
WHT	67	65	60	73	69	50	83				
FRL	58	65	68	63	63	62	77				

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	22	40	41	44	70	65	25				
ELL	42			67							
BLK	27			45							
HSP	58	74		65	50	40	44				
MUL	64			79							
WHT	64	65	57	78	80	70	76				
FRL	56	63	54	68	72	61	65				

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	27	46	38	42	56	52	47				
ELL	14			50							
BLK	82			73							
HSP	52	50		63	67	64	62				
MUL	75			67							
WHT	66	61	52	77	72	51	80				
FRL	55	54	53	62	65	54	66				

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	67
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	69
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	69
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	67
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	65
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 lowest quartile learning gains in math at 56%. The contributing factors for this change may have been a lack of quality tier 1 instruction, a lack of foundational skills acquired by students, teachers' use of resources.

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 was DeBary's overall learning gains in math which decreased by -6%. Lack of targeted small group interventions. The contributing factors for this change may have been a lack of targeted small group instruction.

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 DeBary's overall performance in Science. The contributing factors for this change may have been quality tier 1 instruction, tutoring made available to students in the subject of science, teachers' use of hands on science activities.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was DeBary's overall performance in Science. The contributing factors for this change may have been quality tier 1 instruction, tutoring made available to students in the subject of science, teachers' use of hands on science activities.

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

Based on DeBary's EWS data, an area of concern might be a correlation between the chronic attendance rate in grade 5 and the course failure rate in ELA and Math in grade 5.

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

1. Improve English Language Arts Achievement
2. Improve Learning Gains in Math

3. Improve Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities
4. Improve Utilization of Social Emotional Learning Strategies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities Subgroup
Rationale	According to the ESSA guidelines, DeBary Elementary's students with disabilities were identified as an areas of focus because the subgroup scores fell below the minimum score threshold. Students with disabilities was the lowest performing subgroup at DeBary.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students with disabilities will increase their achievement and learning gains on FSA ELA and Math. Students with disabilities will increase learning gains from 38% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Miller (camiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	DeBary will implement the evidence-based strategy of response to intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Response to intervention will provide early, systematic, and appropriately intensive assistance to students who are at risk. RTI seeks to promote academic success through universal screening, early intervention, frequent progress monitoring, and increasingly intensive research-based instruction or interventions. According to John Hattie, the effect size for response to intervention is 1.29 in reference to a year's worth of growth at the hinge point of .40.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide professional development on equity and diversity in education to faculty. 2. Progress monitor the implementation of small group instruction in ELA and Math. 3.Through PLCs, evaluate the effectiveness of interventions and plan for instruction. 4. Administer iReady assessments and monitor monthly with iReady progress monitoring assessments 5. Through PLCs, discuss the rigor and alignment of core instruction for SWD. 6. Monitor the application and compliance of IEPs and accommodations for SWD.
Person Responsible	Chad Miller (camiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	English Language Arts Proficiency
Rationale	Although our schoolwide proficiency percentage increased by 4%, the schoolwide Language Arts proficiency percentage is the lowest achievement area for DeBary Elementary at 66% proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students taking the Florida Standards Assessment will increase from 66% to 71% proficiency in the area of language arts.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Miller (camiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	DeBary will implement the evidenced-based strategy of collective teacher efficacy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Educators with high efficacy show greater effort and persistence, a willingness to try new approaches, set more challenging goals, and attend more closely to the needs of students who require extra assistance.

Action Step	
Description	1. Administer iReady reading diagnostic assessment and continue monthly with iReady progress monitoring assessments 2. Conduct PLCs on a regular basis for ELA planning and problem-solving 3. Plan for research-based targeted instruction in small group 4. Monitor targeted small group instruction in language arts 5. Provide professional development through PLCs in ELA
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	The schoolwide learning gains in math decreased from 76% to 70% as well as the learning gains of the lowest quartile in math from 61% to 56%. Due to this decrease, a focus on learning gains in math has been chosen as an area of focus.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students taking the Florida Standards Assessment will increase learning gains from 70% to 76% in the area of math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Miller (camiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	DeBary will implement the evidence-based strategy of response to intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Response to intervention will provide early, systematic, and appropriately intensive assistance to students who are at risk. RTI seeks to promote academic success through universal screening, early intervention, frequent progress monitoring, and increasingly intensive research-based instruction or interventions. According to John Hattie, the effect size for response to intervention is 1.29 in reference to a year's worth of growth at the hinge point of .40.

Action Step	
Description	1. Administer iReady math diagnostic assessment 2. Continue monthly with iReady progress monitoring assessments 3. Plan for research-based targeted math instruction in small group 4. Monitor targeted small group instruction in math 5. Provide professional development in math (math engagement & three act tasks)
Person Responsible	Chad Miller (camiller@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, Â§ 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.

Not Applicable

> **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.

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities Subgroup	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts Proficiency	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00