Sugar Mill Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

Demographics

Principal: Carol Sullo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sugarmill/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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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.

With the cooperation of home, school, and community, the Sugar Mill family will provide a warm, caring atmosphere where all children will be challenged to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Panthers Always Will Succeed

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
Speidel, Mary	Principal	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Snodgrass, Traci	Instructional Coach	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Bracciale, Marie	School Counselor	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Whitson, Lianne	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Colucci, Carol	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Bennett, Audra	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Hawver, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Cormier, Marina	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Frantz, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.
Marconi, Christa	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to School Improvement Plan and assist in monitoring grade level expectations.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Carol Sullo

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
55

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	58	84	74	77	78	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

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

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	110	85	93	89	102	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	22	15	13	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	110	85	93	89	102	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	22	15	13	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	61%	56%	57%	58%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	53%	47%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	59%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	56%	62%	55%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	43%	51%	36%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	57%	53%	48%	59%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	60%	-3%	62%	-5%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	60%	-6%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	56%	13%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
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	22	38	46	28	54	50	11				
ELL	43			43							
BLK	30	43	30	27	38	36	17				
HSP	50	60		50	55		38				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	65	66	66	66	71	66	64				
FRL	55	59	51	55	59	45	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	35	20	29	16	5	37				
BLK	30	38		36	24						
HSP	53	41		53	45						
MUL	64			73							
WHT	65	52	26	71	63	31	73				
FRL	53	46	26	61	53	30	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	22	29	31	38	45	25	20				
BLK	54	60		42	27						
HSP	48	35	20	52	47						
MUL	60	62		60	54		50				
WHT	59	54	55	70	60	37	52				
FRL	50	51	45	59	52	36	40				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	32
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	51
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	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
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	56
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 data component that showed the lowest performance Math Lowest 25th Percentile with 53%. The contributing factor to that was that the teachers were not doing small group instruction with those students who needed support wiht the standards they have not mastered.

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 Science Achievement with a 13% drop from the previous year (69% in 2018 and a 56% in 2019). The factors that contributed to this decline was that the 3rd and 4th grade standards had not been mastered by our 5th grade students.

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 Math Achievement. The contributing factor to this gap was that the teachers wwere not doing small group insturction with those students who needed support with the standards they have not mastered.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with +28%. The new actions that we took were small group instruction, writing intervention (Being A Writer), and Sugar Mill Writes.

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

1. Attendance
2. Science

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

1. Science
2. ELA Achievement
3. Math Lowest 25th Percentile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA: reading and writing standards that progress together with the use of accompanying text for writing that embeds four strands: Foundations, Reading, Communication, and Vocabulary. This was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed in the area of ELA Achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	The measureable outcome will be that Sugar Mill Elementary plans to increase ELA achievement from 61% to 65% in 2020-2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented at Sugar Mill Elementary for the Area of Focus will be Small Group Instruction in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for selecting this specific strategey is that Small Group Instruction has a .47 effective size according to John Hattie

Action Steps to Implement

*Facilitate Differentailted PL on Standards Aligned Instruction
*Administer i-Ready Disgnostic to establish baseline data
*Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions/enrichment
*Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction
*Purchase additional resources tosupplement Stardards Aligned Instruction
*Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum NIghts on campus and at off-site locations
*Conduct learning walks with teachers and provide feedback

Person Responsible	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science: Next Genereation Sunshine State Standards that are aligned to the specific course content. This was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed due to the fact that we went from 69% in 2018 to 56% in 2019. That was a 13% drop in our 5th Grade Science scores.
Measurable Outcome:	The measureable outcome will be that Sugar Mill Elementary plans to increase Science achievement from 56% to 61% in 2020-2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented at Sugar Mill Elementary for the Area of Focus will be Standards Based Instruction in Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for selecting this specific strategey is that Standards Based Instruction has a 1.79 effective size according to John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

*Facilitate Differentailted PL on Standards Aligned Instruction
*Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions/enrichment
*Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction
*Purchase additional resources tosupplement Stardards Aligned Instruction
*Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum NIghts on campus and at off-site locations
*Conduct learning walks with teachers and provide feedback

Person Responsible Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Hold all student to high academic standards; prepare all students for success in college and career; guarantee that steps are taken to help students and their schools improve; and hold schools accountable for student outcomes. This was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed for our Black/African American and Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	The measureable outcome will be that Sugar Mill Elementary plans to increase: SWD Subgroup: ELA LG 25% from 46% to 50% in 2020-2021 Math LG 25% from 50% to 54% in 2020-2021 BLK Subgroup: ELA LG 25% from 30% to 34% in 2020-2021 Math LG 25% from 36% to 40% in 2020-2021
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*Conduct monthyl data chats focused on reviewing student grouping and planning for intervention/enrichment *Facilitate Differentailted PL on Standards Aligned Instruction *Administer i-Ready Disgnostic to establish baseline data *Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for selecting this specific strategey is that Standards Based Instruction has a .77 for Students with Learning Needs and .52 for Students with Social Economic Status according to John Hattie.
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math: standards the progress together within the following 5 domains; Number Sense and Operations, Fractions, Algebraic Reasoning, Measurement, Geometric Reasoning, Data Analysis and Probablity. This was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed due to the fact that our Math Lowest 25th Percentile in (3-5) is 53% .
Measurable Outcome:	The measureable outcome is that Sugar Mill Elementary plans to increase the Math Lowest 25% Percentile from 53% to 60% in 2020-2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented at Sugar Mill Elementary for the Area of Focus will be Small Group Instruction in Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for selecting this specific strategey is that Small Group Instruction has a .47 effective size according to John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

*Facilitate Differentailted PL on Standards Aligned Instruction
*Administer i-Ready Disgnostic to establish baseline data
*Conduct monthly data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions/ enrichment
*Conduct collaborative planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction
*Purchase additional resources tosupplement Stardards Aligned Instruction
*Hold intermittent Parent/Curriculum NIghts on campus and at off-site locations
*Conduct learning walks with teachers and provide feedback

Person Responsible	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@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.

We will have full day planning days for each grade level each 9 weeks. Our focus will be to look at the data ad the lower 25% quartile students in the area of ELA/Math/Science using i-Ready Date and District assessemtns.

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.

Sugar Mill Elementary School builds and sustains partnerships with the local community by holding the following events: * Meet the Teacher- Information from various extended day providers will share information via social media, the school website and weekly communication from administration. * Open House- PTA will virtually promote membership amongst parents, grandparents, business partners and community members. Volunteers and Business Partners will share information via social media, the school website and weekly communication from administration. * Volunteer/Business Partner Appreciation Breakfast-Sugar Mill Elementary offers a breakfast to thank all our parents, grandparents, business partners, and community members who have supported our school throughout the school year if CDC guidelines allow. If necessary, virtual celebrations will be held. * Family/Curriculum Nights held on campus and at off-site locations if CDC guidelines allowVolunteers and Business Partners are invited to share information. If necessary, nights will be held virtually.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00