Coronado Beach Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Coronado Beach Elementary School

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

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

Demographics

Principal: Carlos Scott M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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	
* 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

Coronado Beach Elementary School

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	35%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	7%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Coronado Beach Elementary School:
"From marine science to agriscience, educating the next generation of critical thinkers and problem solvers."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Buckner, Tracy	Principal	Liason that facilitates monthly meetings, and reports information back to faculty and staff.
Bartley, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Quigley, Kim	Instructional Coach	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Mullins, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Cloer, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Canfield, Jessica	School Counselor	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Luper, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Williams, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Liason that facilitates monthly meetings, and reports information back to faculty and staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Carlos Scott M

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

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

223

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	32	35	49	31	35	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	12	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	28	51	28	40	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	

2020-21 - 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	28	51	28	40	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				76%	56%	57%	71%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	56%	58%	67%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	46%	53%	53%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				78%	59%	63%	83%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	56%	62%	75%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	43%	51%	75%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				79%	57%	53%	79%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	82%	58%	24%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	59%	9%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	84%	54%	30%	60%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The data below is reflective of the following assessments:
VLT, SMT, VST, Topic Checks, Progress Monitoring Assessments and Volusia Writes.

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	93.33	97.78	88.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	80.0	100.0	100.0
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	86.36	83.67	74.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	100.0	60.0	80.0
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	74.07	96.30	86.67
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0	75.0	100.0
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	76.0	70.37	100.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	50.0	75.0	100.0
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.67	86.11	100.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	25.0	25.0	100.0
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78.79	83.33	68.42
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	66.7	100.0	66.7
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68.42	85.71	80.85
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	40.0	100.0	87.5
	English Language Learners	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36.84	100.0	69.05
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0.0	n/a	62.5
	English Language Learners	100.0	100.0	100.0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58.62	100.0	51.85
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0.0	100.0	66.7
	English Language Learners	0.0	100.0	0.0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85.71	75.86	100.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	100.0	71.4	100.0
	English Language Learners	100.0	100.0	100.0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86.67	62.07	87.10
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	71.4	28.6	85.7
	English Language Learners	100.0	100.0	100.0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25			44							
WHT	81	67		72	56		73				
FRL	74			65			70				
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	33	30		42	64						
HSP	75			67							
WHT	78	73	50	82	72	50	81				
FRL	64	68	45	64	65	50	77				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31			31							
WHT	72	67	58	84	75	83	78				
FRL	56	59	50	76	86	91	75				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	70
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across grade levels, we have observed that there is a trend for improvement among our students that fall into the Math Lower Quartile, as there was a decrease from 47% of Math LQ scoring proficient in 2019 to 17% of Math LQ students scoring proficient in 2021. There is also a need to focus on ELA Learning Gains. In 2019, 70% of our student made learning gains in ELA, whereas in 2021, 58% of our students made learning gains in ELA. This shows a decrease in ELA Learning gains 12%.

Our only current ESSA Subgroup is the SWD subgroup. When analyzing the needs of this subgroup, there was a decrease in performance within the ELA Achievement category from 2019-2021. Additionally, there was a decrease in performance within the Math LQ.
Within our SWD subgroup, there was also a decrease in performance among the Math LQ students. In 2019, 57% of our Math LQ students scored proficient or higher, and in 2021, 25% of our Math LQ students scored proficient or higher. This shows a decrease of 32%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Lowest Quartile and ELA Learning Gains demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. This is based off progress monitoring data in the fall, winter and spring. The data used to draw this conclusion came from the Formative Assessment section of the VCS data dashboard. Specific assessments used include the VLT, SMT, PM, and Topic Checks.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors that led to the need for this improvement include possible learning loss during the COVID pandemic. We will try to fill these gaps in learning by taking the following actions: focused coaching cycles, data driven PLC's. and Professional Learning Opportunities designed based on school need.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd Grade ELA showed the most improvement with 87% students proficient.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our looping model, departmentalization, PLC conversations that occurred to change walk to groups; based on common summative data on a regular basis. Our new action was modifying our walk to intervention model in response to student need.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Knowing and using teacher strengths to create meaningful Walk to Intervention Groups
Rich Professional Learning Plan
Powerful PLC Conversations
Coaching Cycles

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Personalized Coaching Cycles
Teacher Clarity
Data Driven Lesson Planning to inform instruction and increase engagement

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A multi-year Professional Learning Plan focused on teacher clarity that will allow us to learn, implement the learning, get feedback on our implementation and use the feedback to perfect our implementation.
Ensuring that the 4 essential questions are discussed during PLC and all data chats.
Utilizing teachers as leaders to share best practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 78%, ELA Learning Gains were 58% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 67%. According to data provided, our area of focus pertaining to ESSA subgroups will be Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA overall proficiency from 78% to 80%. Increase ELA Lower Quartile from 67% to 70% Increase ELA Learning Gains from 58% to 70%
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tracy Buckner, Assistant Principal Kimberly Williams and Instructional Coach Kimberly Quigley
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and • provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible	Kim Quigley (kaquigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs, Teacher duty day and during PLC's

Person Responsible	Kim Quigley (kaquigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria will be posted to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning during PLC's that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not? Persons responsible will be grade chairs.

Person Responsible Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful. Persons responsible will be grade chairs.

Person Responsible Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 78%, Math Learning Gains were 71% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 47%. According to data provided, our area of focus pertaining to ESSA subgroups will be Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math Achievement from 78% to 80% Increase Math Lower Quartile from 47% to 70% Increase Math Learning Gains from 71% to 73%
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific Math look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Tracy Buckner, Assistant Principal Kimberly Williams and Instructional Coach Kimberly Quigley
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and • provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible	Kim Quigley (kaquigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria will be posted to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning during PLC's that includes planning for alignment between the standard/ benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students. Responsibilities will be shared by admin (principal and assistant principal) and the instructional coach,

Person Responsible   Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not? Persons responsible will be grade chairs.

Person Responsible   Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful. Persons responsible will be grade chairs.

Person Responsible   Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 3: Safe and Supporting Environment, where we ensure that all students and staff are provided with a safe, healthy, and supportive environment focused on learning. As a result of our SEL Panorama survey, Our area where we would benefit from having the strongest focus is in the area of Emotional Regulation. Our baseline results show that 43% of our 3-5th grade students feel they are able to regulate their emotions well. This is slightly above the district average comparison which was 39%.
Measurable Outcome:	Student Emotional Regulation will increase from 43% to 60% by the third Panorama Survey Window.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by our Panorama Administrator, Ms. Williams for each of the three surveys given this school year. By the third survey the Emotional Regulation results will be at or above 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Canfield (jkcanfie@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	utilization of SEL Lessons, School Counselor will provide monthly whole group lessons in addition to small group and individualized lessons. Assistant Principal Ms. Williams will work with the school counselor to provide follow up with students who received a discipline referral. Sanford Harmony will be utilized. The School will also begin training for PBIS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony, is SEL curriculum that has been implemented district wide. It is aligned with CASEL (Collaborative for Academic and Social Emotional Learning. John Hattie's research on factors that positively impact student achievement say that the following influences which can be found within Sanford Harmony have effect sizes resulting in a likelihood to either positively impact or advance student achievement: Positive self concept: 0.41 (potential to advance) Social Skills Programs: 0.39 (likely to have a positive impact) Positive Peer Influences: 0.53 (potential to advance) Strong Classroom Cohesion 0.44 (potential to advance) PBIS, or Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Sanford Harmony, PBIS and SEL lessons found in the ELA texts and materials. Person responsible will be Ms. Williams, Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize SEL Lessons that are embedded in Benchmark Advance and listed in curriculum maps. Although Ms. Buckner is listed as the person responsible below, all teachers will be responsible for the implementation of this and Ms. Williams, assistant principal will be responsible for monitoring.

Person Responsible	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Students in grades 3-5 will participate in panorama survey throughout the year. Person responsible for monitoring this will be Ms. Williams, assistant principal.

Person Responsible Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School Counselor will lead whole group, small group and individual guidance lessons with students. Whole group lessons will occur monthly. Small group lessons and individual lessons will occur as needed.

Person Responsible Jessica Canfield (jkcanfie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Assistant Principal and School Counselor will coordinate on the use of restorative practice type strategies and debrief with students after they have received a discipline referral. Both Ms. William, assistant principal and Ms. Canfield, school counselor will be responsible for this.

Person Responsible Jessica Canfield (jkcanfie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

The school will investigate opportunities to prepare for PBIS implementation in the future.

Person Responsible Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

bullying and threats as areas of concern
although the incident number is high, it was a limited number of students that were considered high incident students.

School will:
Facilitate small group lessons on Social Emotional Well Being and Emotional Regulation
restorative practice statement from last year
identify mentors for students with high incidents of bullying or threats
provide incident data to teacher during our quarterly progress monitoring meetings

Teachers will:
utilize SEL lessons embedded within the Benchmark Advance materials
ensure a positive and effective classroom management system is in place.
communicate specific student needs with all building level stakeholders.

Dats chats will take place quarterly during progress monitoring meetings to discuss above implementation plan (what is working and what is not) based on data.

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.

Schoolwide SEL instruction
Incentive programs in lunchroom
Student Voice groups
Informing stakeholders of school wide themes, events etc. via social media and school website-
Class Spotlight for displaying classroom work digitally
Pirate of the Month-
Teacher Shoutouts-
Positive Referrals- all faculty and staff

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All teachers will be responsible for implementing SEL instruction on a daily basis as integrated in ELA and once weekly via an isolated lesson as stated in the master schedule.
Ms. Williams, Assistant Principal will be responsible for the incentive programs in the lunchroom, and teacher shoutouts.
Ms. Buckner, school principal will be responsible for facilitating student voice groups, and the Pirate of the month staff incentive program.
Ms. Mallory Mussard, media specialist and designated DLTL will be responsible for informing stakeholders of schoolwide themes, events, etc. via social media, school website and spotlighting a class by displaying work digitally.
All Faculty and staff will have the ability to fill out positive referrals when a student is caught displaying positive behaviors or actions.

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: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00