

Volusia County Schools

South Daytona Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

South Daytona Elementary School

600 ELIZABETH PL, South Daytona, FL 32119

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

Demographics

Principal: Katherine Lowrey T

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: D (37%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	CS&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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

South Daytona Elementary School

600 ELIZABETH PL, South Daytona, FL 32119

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">87%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">54%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	C	D

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.

To ensure higher levels of learning for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Daytona Elementary will be a positive, safe Professional Learning Community through the collaborative, trusting relationships of the students, staff and parents. We value diversity, fidelity in academics, innovation, social responsibility, technology, and life long learning. Success for all is our priority and commitment.

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
Schwartz, Gregory	Principal	
Conyers, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Lowrey, Katie	Assistant Principal	
Jilka, Jane	Dean	
Brown, Kate	Teacher, K-12	
Holcombe, Sierra	Instructional Coach	
Pellicer, Megan	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Katherine Lowrey T

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.*

2

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: D (37%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	142	161	130	147	107	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	824
Attendance below 90 percent	21	31	20	13	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	10	5	10	9	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	3	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 5/26/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	142	169	133	155	102	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	839
Attendance below 90 percent	9	40	28	29	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	2	13	16	32	7	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	18	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	2	4	6	21	10	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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
Number of students enrolled	142	169	133	155	102	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	839
Attendance below 90 percent	9	40	28	29	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	2	13	16	32	7	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	18	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	2	4	6	21	10	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	2	1	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	44%	56%	57%	47%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	56%	58%	43%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	53%	28%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	59%	63%	48%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	30%	56%	62%	46%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	43%	51%	29%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	57%	53%	39%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	58%	-5%	58%	-5%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	59%	-23%	64%	-28%
	2018	53%	60%	-7%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	60%	-29%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	56%	-18%	53%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	12	32	42	17	19	14	11				
ELL	25	36		36	50						
BLK	30	36	31	26	23	24	15				
HSP	35	48		38	50		43				
MUL	44	47		36	18						
WHT	54	50	44	59	32	30	57				
FRL	39	41	30	40	28	24	34				
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	5	25	30	9	19	19	8				
ELL	36			27							
BLK	25	24	17	35	40	31	21				
HSP	50	44		45	56		62				
MUL	37	40		43	40						
WHT	52	50	43	66	56	45	64				
FRL	40	39	28	50	48	38	44				
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	5	16	16	9	7	4	16				
BLK	31	36	33	29	44	31	15				
HSP	47	41		44	39						
MUL	32	47		40	36						
WHT	57	46	13	58	50	33	54				
FRL	42	41	28	44	47	27	34				

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)	CS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	262
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	26
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	47
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (25%): teacher turnover was a major contributing factor. We started the year with an almost entirely new intermediate teaching staff. A major barrier was understanding the standards and content being taught. A large percentage of our teachers were in a new grade level, and did not receive professional development or training surrounding the standards. We also struggled to provide effective planning sessions and guided planning sessions.

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

The most significant decline occurred with Math Learning Gains. In the 17-18 school year 50% of our students made a learning gain in Math and in the 18-19 school year only 30% percent of students made a learning gain.

We started the year with an almost entirely new intermediate teaching staff. A major barrier was

understanding the standards and content being taught. A large percentage of our teachers were in a new grade level, and did not receive professional development or training surrounding the standards. We also struggled to provide effective planning sessions and guided planning sessions.

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.

There was a 32% gap when comparing our Math Learning Gains with the Learning gains of the state. We started the year with an almost entirely new intermediate teaching staff. A major barrier was understanding the standards and content being taught. A large percentage of our teachers were in a new grade level, and did not receive professional development or training surrounding the standards. We also struggled to provide effective planning sessions and guided planning sessions.

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

The area with the most improvement was our ELA Learning Gains. In the 17-18 school year, 41% of our students made a learning gain. In the 18-19 school year 44% of our students achieved a learning gain.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance below 90% (K-5)
Suspensions (58)

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

1. Science Proficiency
2. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
3. Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
4. ELA Proficiency
5. Math Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Science Proficiency was at 38%, which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Science proficiency for our 5th grade students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Science proficiency from 38% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our SLT has chosen to focus on standards-aligned instruction with the inclusion of student engagement strategies (collaborative instruction) and bi-weekly indoor labs (hands-on experiments).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Cooperative learning versus individualistic has a .59 effect size according to John Hattie, and the use of Science programs has a .43 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional learning based in the implementation of indoor labs (common experiments) and cooperative learning structures in Science Instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walk-throughs to monitor: instruction, usage of indoor labs, completion of common experiments, and the use of cooperative learning (engagement strategies).

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly PLCs (data review) centered upon Science.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly guided planning sessions centered upon Science Instruction.

Person Responsible Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to conduct data chats after each Topic Check or District Assessment is administered.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create and conduct a process for providing targeted feedback specific to Science Instruction based on administrative walk-throughs.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide modeling and coaching to strengthen core Science instruction (school-based Academic Coach in coordination with District Support Personnel).

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use Collaborative Planning to lesson plan for indoor science labs. Materials for the labs have already been purchased and ready for use.

Person Responsible Megan Pellicer (mpellice@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Science Room (4-17) with all materials and labs needed for classroom use.

Person Responsible Jane Jilka (jejilka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 44%, ELA Learning Gains was at 44% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 37% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA LQ in order to improve ELA LG and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis has revealed that most of the students in our LQ were also in our three targeted ESSA subgroups: SWD, ELL, Black/African-American students, Multi-racial students, Economically disadvantaged students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Lowest Quartile from 37% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher-led Small Group Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions and ESE.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer i-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data

Person Responsible Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly PLCs for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions (K12 Lift guiding questions).

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE and Intervention teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct four learning walks with coaches and teachers during small group instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to conduct data chats after each District Assessment, or school-based summative assessment has been administered.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create and conduct a process for providing targeted feedback to teachers after walk-throughs have been completed.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct ORF to determine students in need of phonics instruction for 3rd through 5th grade.

Person Responsible Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct ORF monthly to progress monitor students in 2nd grade.

Person Responsible Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use ORF to progress monitor students who are in the PST process in 3rd through 5th grade.

Person Responsible Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide modeling and coaching to strengthen core instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a targeted plan addressing intervention and enrichment.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was 44%, Math Learning Gains was 30% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 25% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our three targeted ESSA subgroups: SWD, ELL, Black/African-American, Multi-racial students, Economically disadvantaged students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Lowest Quartile from 25% to 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher-led Small Group Instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize Master Schedule focused on proper placement of students for Interventions and ESE.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer i-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data.

Person Responsible Katie Lowrey (klowrey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions (K12 Lift Guiding Questions).

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE and Intervention teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct four learning walks with coaches and teachers during small group instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule to conduct data chats after each Topic Check and/or District Assessment has been administered.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create and conduct a process for providing targeted feedback to teachers after walk-throughs.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide modeling and coaching to strengthen core instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Conyers (hmconyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a targeted plan addressing intervention and enrichment schedule.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ten minutes a day in the schedule during the math block for math fluency.

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Based on the Needs Assessment survey results, our SLT will focus on fostering and building collective efficacy across our campus. The SLT will also continue the implementation of our PBIS plan.

Our goal is to increase both ELA and Math achievement from 44% to 55%, we also would like to decrease the number of students that are below the 90% attendance rate from 110 students to 50 students.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Creating a positive school culture is one of the most important aspects of having a successful school year. School culture starts with the administrative team and includes the teachers, staff, students, parents and community members. Administration will need to provide stimulating professional development, be achievement oriented, be involved with the day to day tasks at the school level and in the classroom and use effective time management to stay actively involved in each class.

Administration will meet with local city leaders (mayor, police chief, fire chief, business owners, city council members and parents as well as the PTA) to discuss all aspects of school life. We will use the information received from that meetings to help address any needs that were uncovered. We will continue to work with our local community leaders as the school year progress to build meaningful relationships that will impact student development and achievement.

Teachers will need to build positive relations with their students, as we know "they don't care how much you know, until they know how much you care". The teacher and administration will need to foster positive uplifting relationships with the families community members.

Once we are able to host school wide events we will happily invite our parents on campus to be actively involved with their students education. School wide plays, chorus events, clubs, enrichment activities and award ceremonies are some ways to engage our families.

Administration will send out midyear and end of year survey to our teachers, staff, students and families to get a gauge on our success of a postie school culture.

We will also use the following programs to help create and maintain a positive school culture:

- School-Wide SEL & Behavioral Plan (Sanford Harmony, Restorative Practices, PBIS, CHAMPS)
- EWS Monitoring
- Induction Plan (new teacher, students)
- Celebrations & Traditions
- Coaching Culture
- Mentoring Program
- Teacher & Student Voice (perception surveys)
- Fostering Student Leaders (safety patrol, student council, honor clubs, awards)

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$37,060.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
6400	120-Classroom Teachers	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$31,500.00	
<i>Notes: Guided Planning (1hr/week x \$25 x 18weeks x 70 teachers)</i>						
6400	210-Retirement	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,150.00	
<i>Notes: Guided Planning Retirement @ 10%</i>						
6400	220-Social Security	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$2,410.00	
<i>Notes: Guided Planning Social Security @ 7.65%</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$251,667.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
6100	312-Subagreements greater than \$25,000	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$52,767.00	
<i>Notes: Contracted Services for Behavior Specialist to manage behavior plans</i>						
5100	120-Classroom Teachers	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$54,241.00	
<i>Notes: Salary for Intervention Teacher</i>						
5100	210-Retirement	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,424.00	
<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Retirement @ 10%</i>						
5100	220-Social Security	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,149.00	
<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Social Security @ 7.65%</i>						
5100	230-Group Insurance	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,853.00	
<i>Notes: Insurance for Intervention Teacher @ \$5,853</i>						
5100	230-Group Insurance	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$36.00	
<i>Notes: Life Insurance for Intervention Teacher @ .066%</i>						
5100	240-Workers Compensation	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$814.00	
<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for Intervention Teachers @ 1.5%</i>						
6140	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$62,000.00	
<i>Notes: Salary for SEL TOA</i>						

	6140	210-Retirement	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$6,200.00
			<i>Notes: SEL TOA Retirement @ 10%</i>			
	6140	220-Social Security	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,743.00
			<i>Notes: SEL TOA Social Security @ 7.65%</i>			
	6140	230-Group Insurance	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,853.00
			<i>Notes: SEL TOA Insurance @ \$5,853</i>			
	6140	230-Group Insurance	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$41.00
			<i>Notes: SEL TOA Life Insurance @ .066%</i>			
	6140	240-Workers Compensation	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$930.00
			<i>Notes: SEL TOA Workers Compensation @ 1.5%</i>			
	5100	360-Rentals	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$38,616.00
			<i>Notes: Site Licenses (iReady, Ready Reading, IXL) (IXL \$3,501.00)</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,988.00
			<i>Notes: SEL Materials and Supplies for students to use with SEL TOA</i>			
	6400	110-Administrators	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$2,220.00
			<i>Notes: Assistant Principal's Summer Planning/data collection (2 staff x \$37 x 10hrs x 3 days)</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$2,040.00
			<i>Notes: Academic Coaches Summer Planning/data collection (2 staff x \$34 x 10hrs x 3 days)</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$426.00
			<i>Notes: Assistant Principal and Coaches Summer Retirement @ 10%</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$326.00
			<i>Notes: Assistant Principal and Coaches Summer Social Security @ 7.65%</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$70,517.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$54,241.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Intervention Teacher</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,424.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Retirement @ 10%</i>			

	5100	220-Social Security	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,149.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher Social Security @ 7.65%</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,853.00
			<i>Notes: Insurance for Intervention Teacher @ \$5,853</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$36.00
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance for Intervention Teacher @ .066%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	6234 - South Daytona Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$814.00
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for Intervention Teacher @ 1.5%</i>			
					Total:	\$375,440.00