

Volusia County Schools

Spirit 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	22

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Laura Figueroa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	22

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

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.

Spirit Elementary is committed to ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to become a responsible, productive citizen able to cope with changing social and economic conditions. The staff of Spirit Elementary strives to meet the individual needs of each student, taking into consideration their unique attributes and capabilities. High academic achievement by students is of the utmost concern to the school's primary stakeholders, which includes parents, teachers and administrators. Therefore, parental involvement is a key component to the success of our school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spirit believes we are the difference between what is and what could be for students.

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
Devaney, Carrie Ann	Principal	Leading systematic review of all available data throughout the year by school improvement team members to determine the progress of action steps and the effectiveness of identified steps in the action plan and progress toward the measurable outcome. The principal will work to eliminate barriers identified by the team through identified resources.
Robinson, Jamie	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mr. Robinson will assist in the systematic review of ongoing student and school data to evaluate the progress of action steps and progress toward measurable outcomes. Mr. Robinson will assist in reducing or eliminating identified barriers, and provide input to the team regarding barriers, resources, and examination of data.
GAETJENS, MICHELLE	Instructional Media	Ms. Gaetjens as an instructional technology specialist will assist in providing input on barriers, student data and current school performance levels. Ms. Gaetjens will assist in the use of technology to reach out to families about the instructional program. Ms. Gaetjens will assist in monitoring the progress of Spirit Elementary toward our school improvement goals and determine solutions to barriers to our success.
TUFARIELLO, DARLENE	Instructional Coach	Ms. Tufariello as an instructional coach will provide input into the barriers facing teachers and students. Ms. Tufariello will work with teachers and the SIP team members to examine the data, reflect on progress and monitor action steps. Ms. Tufariello will assist teachers with pedagogical strategies and techniques to improve instructional outcomes for students. Ms. Tufariello will implement a PLC structure that leads teachers through the examination of scaffolding instruction of upcoming standards and ensuring the depth of the standard is being taught to all learners.
Richards, Carol	Instructional Coach	Ms. Tufariello as an instructional coach will provide input into the barriers facing teachers and students. Ms. Tufariello will work with teachers and the SIP team members to examine the data, reflect on progress and monitor action steps. Ms. Tufariello will assist teachers with pedagogical strategies and techniques to improve instructional outcomes for students. Ms. Tufariello will implement a PLC structure that leads teachers through the examination of scaffolding instruction of upcoming standards and ensuring the depth of the standard is being taught to all learners.
Morales-Torres, Nitza	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Morales as the English for Speakers of Other Languages specialist will ensure the examination of data to include ESOL students. In addition Ms. Morales will work with teachers to ensure this ESSA subgroup of students are being instructed using the WIDA Can Do Descriptors according to their DUESS date and WIDA levels if applicable. Ms. Morales will assist teachers in reviewing the progress data of our ESOL students, providing support with teaching practices and instructional accommodations to assist ESOL student in achieving a proficient understanding of the standards. In addition, Ms. Morales will monitor the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		action steps, provide input on barriers and successes and reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes.
French, Laura	Teacher, ESE	Ms. French as the Exceptional Student Education specialist will ensure the examination of data to include students with disabilities. In addition, Ms. French will work with teachers to ensure this ESSA subgroup of students are being instructed using the accommodations in their IEP's. Ms. French will assist teachers in reviewing the progress data of our ESE students, providing support with teaching practices and instructional accommodations to assist ESE students in achieving a proficient understanding of the standards. In addition, Ms. French will monitor the action steps, provide input on barriers and successes, and reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes of 42% or higher of ESE students achieving proficiency.
Hoskins, Danyel	Teacher, K-12	As an intervention specialist, Ms. Hoskins will lead the intervention team through the analysis of ongoing progress monitoring data for students who are not yet proficient in below grade-level standards. The intervention teachers will monitor our data and action steps to reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes.
Taylor-Mearhoff, Cheryl	School Counselor	Our school counselor Dr. TM will assist in the identification of barriers, strategies to overcome barriers and examination of student data to monitor the progress of our students in social-emotional skills. Dr. TM will assist teachers in developing plans for students who need tier 2 support in social-emotional skills. Dr. TM will assist in examining and reflecting on our measurable outcomes of providing targeted support to students who lack the social-emotional skills to participate in the learning environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Laura Figueroa

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

52

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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	87	79	83	84	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	99	105	97	129	108	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	8	18	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	20	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	99	105	97	129	108	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	8	18	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	20	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	56%	57%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	53%	52%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	59%	63%	47%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	56%	62%	38%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	57%	53%	48%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	56%	-10%	53%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	56%	1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	40	29	31	59	50	29				
ELL	38	56	46	40	54	32	33				
BLK	32	32	23	40	56	42	26				
HSP	44	54	43	43	50	25	37				
WHT	50	52	27	53	60	50	64				
FRL	44	48	37	47	56	37	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	43	42	31	51	38	40				
ELL	32	33	29	33	52	36	35				
BLK	43	44	58	38	56	45	42				
HSP	39	43	35	36	53	41	43				
WHT	57	51	53	64	68	39	71				
FRL	44	47	44	46	58	40	51				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	39	43	18	21	19	24				
ELL	41	51	42	38	47	33	16				
ASN	64			73							
BLK	37	63		31	37		50				
HSP	53	54	46	42	37	38	49				
WHT	62	63	52	54	38	32	45				
FRL	51	59	53	43	40	38	45				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	46
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	51
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	48
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.

Math Lowest Quartile 36

ELA Lowest Quartile 37

A factor that contributed to last year's low performance was the alignment of intervention and core instruction.

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

ELA Lowest Quartile 7 percent decrease

Math Lowest Quartile 5 percent decrease

A factor that contributed to this decline was the design of the tier 3 support system. A more systematic approach to intervention is needed.

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.

Achievement in ELA and Math

A factor that contributed to the gap was the alignment of core instruction and the effective use of achievement level descriptors in grades 3-5.

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

Learning Gains in ELA

District training on the depth of the standards and pedagogy, students setting goals and tracking their progress. Teacher's use of ELA and Math Achievement Level Descriptors

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

One potential area of concern on the EWS is the number of level 1s on the statewide assessment.

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

1. Effective use of PLC
2. Implementing tier 2 guidance intervention
3. Differentiation and scaffolding of instruction for students
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers described a need to analyze the standards in reading and math and collaborate on scaffolding strategies and differentiated outcomes to increase student achievement on grade-level standards.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency in grades 3-5 in ELA will increase by 9 percent and in Math, 3-5 grades will increase by 11 percent and will be measured by FSA data. Eighty percent of our K-2 students will perform on or above grade level overall in ELA and Math on the I-Ready diagnostic assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative learning among colleagues that focus on improving a problem of practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers need an in-depth understanding of the standards in ELA and Math. Teachers need an understanding of scaffolding strategies that enable students with deficits to participate in grade-level instruction and achieve success on grade-level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches will plan and lead PLC's that address upcoming standards in ELA and math. Teams of teachers will be trained in PLC protocol and procedures. They will analyze the standards, develop success criteria using achievement level descriptors in grades 3-5, develop progress monitoring formative assessments and determine scaffolding strategies needed for students with deficits using Depth of Knowledge levels.

Person Responsible: DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Admin will set aside time for PLC's by planning PLC schedules weekly during the teacher's planning period.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaches and teachers will review formative data weekly to determine supports needed for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on grade-level standards.

Person Responsible: Carol Richards (clrichar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Parent involvement in the curriculum and their student's achievement. Based on the SAC school climate survey results parents wanted more information on instructional programs.

Measurable Outcome:

Parent involvement as measured by the SAC climate survey will increase. Parent participation in virtual curriculum nights will increase. Parent involvement in parent and teacher conferences will increase. 100% of the parents that completed the survey will state they learned about the instructional programs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Parent involvement in the instructional program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

85% of our parents are connected to our Class Dojo. Teachers report using class dojo to communicate non-instructional information and behavior of students. If we involve parents in understanding and supporting the instructional program than student achievement will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will develop parent messages for each subject area indicating what standards will be taught the following week, how families can support their students in learning these standards, and what success will look like when students are proficient on the standards.

Person

Responsible Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School-wide virtual curriculum nights will be held for teachers to communicate the standards and at-home activities to support the standards to families.

Person

Responsible DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers and Families will be trained on Class dojo and school social media communication platforms will be offered virtually on a flexible schedule.

Person

Responsible MICHELLE GAETJENS (mjgaetje@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA subgroup data indicated that students with disabilities performed below the required threshold of 41%, Spirit's students with disabilities performed at 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities will perform at or above the state threshold of 41% proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities will receive tier 3 researched-based intensive instruction to reduce deficits and increase proficiency on grade-level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Identified ESSA subgroup below state threshold.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop tier 3 intervention schedule for all students with disabilities that does not detract from core instruction.

Person Responsible Laura French (lmfrench@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide teacher training on utilizing accommodations and scaffolding to increase the proficiency of students on grade-level standards.

Person Responsible Carol Richards (clrichar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor the progress of students with disabilities on formative data throughout the year by reviewing their formative assessment results and IEP goals during PLC's to help with planning standards-based instruction incorporating their accommodations . Evaluate the services and needs of students with disabilities not making progress toward grade-level proficiency every 4 weeks.

Person Responsible Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

SOS, Save our Subgroup focus group will be continued. This group teaches African-American/black students skills needed to monitor their progress, set achievement goals, provides mentors and coaching and teaches self-advocacy

Person Responsible Danyel Hoskins (dbhoskin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaches and teachers will review subgroup data on formative and lready assessments to illuminate achievement gaps as they develop.

Person Responsible DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@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.

Spirit Elementary's school leadership team will address the number of students earning a level 1 on the statewide assessment and proficiency and growth for all students by conducting wrap around care meetings. Students identified by ELA decision trees and math and ELA assessment data are discussed by the wrap-around care team every 4 weeks. The team consists of the principal, assistant principal, academic coaches, school counselor, 4 academic intervention teachers, grade level teachers and ESE team lead. Each student's cum folder and all academic records are reviewed and current interventions and their data points are discussed. If students are responding to current interventions we stay the course. If students' progress is minimal or the student is not progressing we discuss what else we can do to provide additional support for the student's area of deficit.(s). The team determines if they have a seat in their groups or if we can work within the grade level team to address the student's needs. We can also recommend the team meet with the school psychologist if the student is already receiving their 3 academic intervention and the response is minimal or there is no response. We record action steps and who is responsible for them and what data points will be reviewed during the next wrap around session on the student care forms. These forms are kept electronically so that all stakeholders can access and update information as needed. We also address social-emotional needs by determining if the student qualifies for tier 2 support from the counselor or if they are not responding to the existing tier 2 group with the counselor they are referred for tier 3 or 1:1 care with an outside agency with parent permission.

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.

Spirit Elementary uses Class Dojo, Twitter, Facebook and our school website to solicit feedback from stakeholders, share school vision and mission. In addition we share pictures of school, students, achievements and successes on our platforms.

Students are recognized using positive referrals on the morning news. Teachers fill out positive referrals for students who demonstrate our core values: being safe, being their best, being responsible, and being respectful and kind, or showing great improvement in _____. The teachers add comments that are read aloud on the news. The admin team takes pictures with the students who are recognized and they receive a key chain with "you are the difference" embroidered on the back. The student gets a "flag" for their key chain each time they are recognized with a positive referral.

Spirit Elementary will hold virtual curriculum events to assist parents in understanding student standards, performance expectations and how they can support their learners at home.

The school counselor holds tier 2 groups for students who are on tier 2 behavior plans or who struggle with

coping or advocacy. Students who do not respond to the small group are recommended to outside agencies for tier 3 or 1:1 support.

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: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00