

Volusia County Schools

Friendship 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Friendship Elementary School

2746 FULFORD ST, Deltona, FL 32738

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

Demographics

Principal: William Rednour A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Friendship Elementary School

2746 FULFORD ST, Deltona, FL 32738

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 88% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 67% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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.

Friendship Elementary will empower ALL students to succeed by providing high quality, equitable, and positive educational experiences that build academic success and a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through inclusive collaborative practices, Friendship Elementary will create a safe, positive, supportive learning environment where each student is valued and empowered to reach their fullest potential.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Velez, Eidie | Principal | Principal: Lead or Head Coach for improvement of the school and instruction. Sets the mission & vision for the school and is responsible for monitoring the continued progress and growth of students and teachers. Ensures provided budget supports the needs of the students and the instructional & professional needs of the teachers. Ensures the school culture is positive and the learning environment is conducive to learning for all students. |
| Aivazis, Jessica | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal is in support of the mission and vision and serves in the capacity or manager of operations overseeing facilities and student behavior. The assistant principal works with the principal as part of the school leadership team in an effort to help develop teachers, schedules and ensure teacher best practices to move the school forward. |
| Campbell, Dylan | Instructional Coach | The role of the Instructional Coach is to support and develop teacher best practice through the implementation of the coaching model. The IC models instructional best practices and support teachers toward developing their own plan for professional improvement. The IC also works closely with the Principal as a member of the SLT to provide professional development and to focus all practice toward improving overall instruction to meet established academic achievement. |
| McCoy, Becky | Teacher, K-12 | Reading Intervention K-12 teacher works closely with students. They monitor the classroom, state and district data to develop a plan of improvement for students who struggle in reading. They provide students with targeted interventions to fill the existing gaps in the learning of these struggling students. |
| Shank, Robin | Teacher, K-12 | The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targeted instruction utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student ongoing progress and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content. |
| Yonker, Michael | Teacher, K-12 | The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targeted instruction utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student ongoing progress and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content. |
| Rodriguez, Nancy | Teacher, K-12 | The ESOL Teacher is responsible for providing targeted intervention to ESOL students based on their LEP goals. The ESOL Teacher works to |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|--------------|--|
| | | ensure students progress in their current grade level based on the support model. They make recommendations and modifications when the data collected shows the students are not successful with present practice. |
| Collins, Cynthia | Teacher, ESE | The ESE Teacher is responsible for providing targeted intervention to ESE students based on their IEP goals. The ESE Teacher works to ensure students progress in their current grade level based on the support model. They make recommendations and modifications when the data collected shows the students are not successful with present practice. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, William Rednour A

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |

| | |
|--|--|
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 64 | 73 | 70 | 73 | 75 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 408 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 7/28/2020

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 | 59 | 74 | 65 | 71 | 75 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 393 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 1 | 7 | 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 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 59 | 74 | 65 | 71 | 75 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 393 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 1 | 7 | 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 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 48% | 56% | 57% | 57% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 57% | 56% | 58% | 50% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65% | 46% | 53% | 50% | 44% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 52% | 59% | 63% | 65% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | 56% | 62% | 38% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | 43% | 51% | 34% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 52% | 57% | 53% | 56% | 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 | 44% | 58% | -14% | 58% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 56% | 0% | 57% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 56% | 54% | 2% | 58% | -2% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 37% | 54% | -17% | 56% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 54% | -4% | 56% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 51% | -9% | 55% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 13% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 53% | 60% | -7% | 62% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 58% | -3% | 62% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 62% | 59% | 3% | 64% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 60% | -14% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 60% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 57% | -3% | 61% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 52% | 56% | -4% | 53% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 56% | -9% | 55% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 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 | 21 | 56 | 67 | 24 | 33 | 25 | | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 45 | | 38 | 35 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 56 | | 32 | 21 | | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 59 | 67 | 57 | 56 | 42 | 53 | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 54 | | 58 | 55 | | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 56 | 70 | 49 | 41 | 30 | 46 | | | | |

| 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 | 12 | 32 | 42 | 4 | 16 | 18 | | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 44 | | 44 | 41 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 44 | | 33 | 25 | | 42 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 54 | 73 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 35 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 41 | | 64 | 41 | | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 40 | 38 | 52 | 37 | 20 | 45 | | | | |
| 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 | 21 | 50 | 63 | 32 | 27 | 35 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 59 | 60 | 54 | 59 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 36 | | 62 | 32 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 45 | 44 | 62 | 35 | 40 | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 61 | | 67 | 45 | | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 49 | 52 | 63 | 38 | 34 | 55 | | | | |

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 | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 407 |
| 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% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 40 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 36 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 55 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance for Friendship was the learning gains of our Lowest 25% in Math. It was also the lowest for several of our subpopulations: SWD's, ELL & African Americans.

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

The greatest decline was the learning gains of the lowest 25% in Math. This decline was due to lack of student focus, lack of teacher clarity of the standards/progression, as well as lack of alignment and collaboration between our Instructional Support Staff & Gen Ed Teachers to support students appropriately.

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 math learning gains lowest 25% was 21 points below the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap was student engagement and alignment of standards.

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

The most improvement was shown in the learning gains of our lowest 25% in ELA. The factors that contributed to this can be attributed to focused data analysis, targeted small group reading intervention, feedback & PLC's.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data we identified that our two areas of concern are the number of Level 1's on the State Assessment, as well as the number of students with Attendance below 90%.

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

1. Math Lowest 25% related to learning gains.
2. ESSA Subgroups performance of our African American, ELL & SWD's in the areas Math & Science.
3. SEL as it pertains to Discipline and Attendance.
4. Math performance overall for all grades.
5. Maintain our ELA Lowest 25% learning gains at 65% or above.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our first area of focus is Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning. This was identified as an area of focus because we noticed a lack of teacher clarity on the standards as evidenced by the decrease in all areas of Math on the 2019 FSA, our Math Learning Gains were 13 percent below the state average. This was also noted during Learning Walks & PLC's.

Measurable Outcome: The Learning Walks using the IPG will show that we have standards aligned instruction in 80% of classrooms observed as noted in Core Action 1. Also closing the achievement gap for our lowest 25% on District & State Assessments at a Federal Index of 45% or above. Weekly time for collaborative planning for cohesive & equity of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence based strategies will include: Professional Learning Community (PLC) strategies, using data from multiple sources and standards-aligned lesson plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These evidence-based strategies were chosen based on their High Effect size of Collective Teacher Efficacy of 1.57. According John Hattie (2009), the best way for improving schools was to organize teacher collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators that the learning team will track, gathering evidence, ongoing data analysis, so that collaborative teams can analyze results for selecting instructional strategies that work best.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a systematic plan and calendar/schedule for Collaborative Planning Times.

Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Determine Staff Development Needs by collecting teacher input.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Training on the PLC Cycle and Collaborative Planning Expectations

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Provide teachers with data, resources for analyzing data through the coaching model through Professional Development.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Learning Walks using the IPG or tool. Provide feedback to instructional staff.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Meet with coaches to discuss and align resources to collaborative teams as needed.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Analyze school wide trends and adjust instructional practices as needed.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our second area of focus was Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math by providing evidence based practices that are aligned to the standards and have a focus on the progression through the five domains of math all students in targeted subgroups will achieve success.

Measurable Outcome: Increase lowest 25% learning gains from 30% to 45%.
Increase Math Learning Gains from 47% to 57%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Refine systematic practices and increase the knowledge of instructional strategies through coaching, modeling, sharing, and professional learning for implementation of focused standards aligned instruction and best instructional strategies to increase the math skills of all students in all 5 areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Expansion of best teaching practices to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze Math Data from i-Ready Math Diagnostic 1.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Creation of Math Data Wall to analyze and monitor school wide trends.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop plan of action for professional learning and systematic practices for implementation.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Communicate plan and collect teacher input.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Provide teachers with data, resources for analyzing data and provide individual support through the coaching model.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor through Learning Walks, Quick Checks and Data Days.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our third area of focus was Culture and Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity. This was chosen as an area of focus to increase inclusive equitable practices for all subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: This will be measured by a decrease on our Early Warning Systems for Discipline & Attendance, which will then show an increase in academic achievement and engagement in all academic areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Inclusive Best Practices for Diversity & Equity.
District Based Staff to provide training.
School Counselor to provide SEL lessons for classroom use.
Differentiated Instruction, Tutoring & Intervention for students in identified subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for the evidence based strategy is to train staff on Diverse & Equity Instructional Practices.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Early Warning System Data

Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify At Risk Students

Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop Monitoring Plans for Specific Students

Person Responsible Diana Dean (dcdean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Determine Staff Development Needs through Staff Survey's.

Person Responsible Diana Dean (dcdean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Train Teachers on Staff Development Needs: Equity & Diversity; Inclusive Practices; Etc

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Walkthroughs to monitor Social Emotional Learning in classrooms through the use of a monitoring tool.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Ongoing monitoring of Early Warning System.

Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring of student survey's at the beginning, middle and end of the year.

Person Responsible Diana Dean (dcdean@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.

Another Area of Focus would be in increasing our positive school culture through an increase in Leadership opportunities for staff and students, positive incentives for staff and students and a systematic approach for a House System for engaging 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.

We at FES, will foster positive relationships with community, parents and families through our communication plan which includes newsletters, other paper-based literature, our connect calls and school-based family events. FES will also host several events throughout the year to which these parties are invited. At these events we showcase student work and what we do as a school community to promote academic, social and emotional and behavioral success. Our parental and community advisory boards (SAC/PTO) are other opportunities to have feedback from these stakeholders. We also have a parent liaison who will serve to build community involvement through the parent center. The liaison will work with parents to provide helpful support in assisting and educating parents on ways to support their child's academic success. Through our Volunteer Coordinator FES will foster relationships with outside entities wanting to invest time in support of education through small donations or through mentoring of our students.

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: Collaborative Planning | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| | Total: \$0.00 |
|--|-----------------------------|