

Volusia County Schools

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

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

Demographics

Principal: Widalis Camacho

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/mcinnis/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	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

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.

McInnis staff, students, and community work together to encourage life long learning in order to achieve our goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McInnis Elementary ensures academic excellence by motivating students through diverse learning experiences and celebrating individual successes.

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
Struska, Paul	Principal	
Cortes, Catherine	Assistant Principal	
Cruces, Lilia	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Koplas, Lynette	Teacher, K-12	
Dail, Elba	Teacher, K-12	
Montalvo, Sara	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Widalis Camacho

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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

369

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

8

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

5

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	59	39	63	58	73	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	1	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/9/2021

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	62	62	65	45	57	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	3	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	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	1	2	10	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	62	62	65	45	57	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	3	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	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	1	2	10	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				40%	56%	57%	43%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	46%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	46%	53%	47%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	59%	63%	61%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	56%	62%	66%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	43%	51%	65%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	57%	53%	52%	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	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	56%	-18%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Math and ELA iReady Diagnostics #1, #2, and #3. Volusia Science Test (2nd-5th Grade)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/8.47	65/20	64/40.63
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/6	56/14.29	54/35.19
	Students With Disabilities	6/0	6/0	6/0
	English Language Learners	15/0	17/11.76	19/26.32
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58/6.9	64/10.94	62/38.71
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/6.12	55/5.45	52/32.69
	Students With Disabilities	6/0	6/0	6/50
	English Language Learners	15/0	16/6.25	18/23.4

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54/24.07	63/33.33	61/40.98
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/25	52/32.69	51/43.14
	Students With Disabilities	9/11.11	12/8.33	10/10
	English Language Learners	17/23.53	19/15.79	18/22.22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54/16.67	61/13.11	57/38.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/18.18	49/10.2	47/38.3
	Students With Disabilities	9/22.22	10/10	9/22.22
	English Language Learners	16/12.5	18/0	17/17.65
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64/37.5	65/50.77	67/65.67
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/30	51/43.14	53/64.15
	Students With Disabilities	17/17.65	17/23.53	19/26.32
	English Language Learners	34/5.88	34/20.59	35/48.57
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61/14.75	65/26.15	65/50.77
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/8.16	51/17.65	51/47.06
	Students With Disabilities	15/13.33	18/5.56	16/31.25
	English Language Learners	33/3.03	34/8.82	35/34.29

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44/15.91	48/18.75	57/28.07
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/11.9	45/15.56	51/27.45
	Students With Disabilities	17/11.76	18/11.11	21/19.05
	English Language Learners	21/4.76	24/0	29/10.34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43/13.95	46/34.78	50/52
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/9.76	43/32.56	44/54.55
	Students With Disabilities	16/0	18/16.67	19/26.32
	English Language Learners	21/4.76	22/13.64	24/41.67
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54/30.36	55/27.42	55/30.51
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/28.85	51/25.86	51/29.09
	Students With Disabilities	15/12.5	16/0	16/0
	English Language Learners	32/21.21	33/24.32	33/19.44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54/11.11	54/37.04	55/43.64
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/10	50/38	51/43.14
	Students With Disabilities	15/0	16/6.25	16/6.25
	English Language Learners	32/9.38	33/27.27	33/39.39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	241/69	203/74	162/80
	Economically Disadvantaged	226/69	187/72	151/80
	Students With Disabilities	67/67	54/56	47/63
	English Language Learners	144/75	122/70	99/82

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	6	28		17	56		36				
ELL	16	31		37	59		34				
HSP	26	41		45	66		43				
WHT	49	56		58	63		41				
FRL	31	44	27	47	63	33	40				
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	2	39	55	22	37	32	5				
ELL	36	62	55	46	54	35	33				
HSP	39	60	52	50	49	30	38				
WHT	45	67		57	56		45				
FRL	37	58	48	48	49	33	39				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	5	30	44	24	52	53					
ELL	30	41	42	49	63	70	33				
HSP	38	44	39	58	69	65	44				
WHT	56	48		70	56		85				
FRL	43	46	45	60	67	62	50				

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	46
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	53
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	43
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?

Students with disabilities are significantly underperforming their non-disabled peers across content areas and grade levels. (SY 20-21: overall ELA proficiency 36%; ELA LQ 33%; ELA LG 47%; 28% ELA LG for SWD; math LQ 38%)

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

ELA Achievement of Students With Disabilities is the areas with the greatest need for improvement. (SY 20-21 28% ELA LG for SWD)

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

Teacher changes for SWD's. At-home learning during the 2019 school year and beginning of 2020-2021 school year many SWD's were learning via Volusia Live and having significant barriers based on technology issues. Changes needed: Stable teaching staff throughout the year for all students. Face-to-face learning for SWD's. Consistent, daily implementation of Specially Designed Instruction. (SWD: SY 18-19 ELA proficiency 2%, LG 39%, LQ 55%; SY 20-21 ELA proficiency 6%, LG 28%, LQ 17%)

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

Math learning gains (SY 18-19 49%; SY 20-21 65%)

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

Reflex Math. SIP Area of Focus on Math. Significant professional development about math teaching and learning. Classroom visits and feedback. Data chats for ongoing progress monitoring. All of these were new actions taken that positively impacted improvement in this area. (SY 18-19 49%; SY 20-21 65%)

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

Daily walk-to-intervention that includes remediation and enrichment for students in ELA and Math based on ongoing assessment data. (SY 18-19: ELA LQ 52%, Math LQ 32%; SY 20-21 ELA LQ 33%, Math LQ 38%)

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.

Professional development related to effective strategies for teaching students with disabilities in ELA and Math. (School-Based ERPL #1: ELA for SWD; District ERPL #1--Success Criteria, #2--ASPECTS)

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

Ongoing implementation of new learning from Professional Development related to SWD's. (monthly classroom visits with District staff followed with specific feedback for teachers; weekly PLC meetings with classroom teachers and SF teachers; quarterly data chats)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows that our SWD subgroup performance decreased from 2018-19 to 2020-21 in the following areas: ELA LG (39% to 28%); ELA LQ (55% to 17%); Math proficiency (22%-17%);
Measurable Outcome:	Increase learning gains in ELA for SWD's from 28% to 33%.
Monitoring:	Monitored using common assessments. Regular data monitoring for SWD's with ESE teachers. Quarterly Data Chats with teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Efficacy with a focus on standard-aligned, focused daily instruction for all students. When it comes to student performance on reading and math tests, a teacher is estimated to have two to three times the impact of any other school factor, including services, facilities, and even leadership.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie - Collective Teacher Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 When collective efficacy is a focus, teachers show more positive attitudes toward professional development (Rauf, Ali, Aluwi, & Noor, 2012). Exhibit deeper implementation of evidence-based instructional strategies (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008; Parks, Solmon, & Lee, 2007). Have a stronger focus on academic pursuits (Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002). Have higher levels of motivation, relationship satisfaction, and intent to stay in the profession (Carrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly PLC's with Support Facilitation Teachers - Struska
 District-supported learning walks to provide feedback for ESE teachers and Gen. Ed. teachers with SWD's. - Struska/Kremposky
 Recurring data chats for ESE teachers. - Struska/Kremposky
 Professional development for all teachers regarding effective practices relating to SWD's. - Struska/Kremposky

Person Responsible Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Achievement and ELA LQ were the two lowest performing areas across grade levels on state assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA Achievement for all students from 36% to 41%. Increase ELA LQ Learning Gains from 33% to 36%.
Monitoring:	Ongoing common, standard-aligned assessments. Classroom visits, feedback, and support. Professional development opportunities with ongoing monitoring and support for implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Catherine Cortes (clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's Glossary defines Response to Intervention as "an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention and frequent progress measurement." Response to Intervention - 1.07 effect size.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention - 1.07 effect size. Rti involves screening students to see who is at-risk, deciding whether supporting intervention will be given in class or out of class, using research-based teaching strategies within the chosen intervention setting, closely monitoring the progress, and adjusting the strategies being used when enough progress is not being made.
Action Steps to Implement	
Ongoing progress monitoring of ELA achievement for all students. - Struska/Cortes	
Classroom visits, feedback, and support. - Struska/Cortes/Larrabee/R.Dail	
Professional development opportunities with ongoing monitoring and support for implementation. - Struska/Kremposky/Klynstra/Cortes/R.Dail/Larrabee	
Provide daily ELA enrichment and intervention for all students. - Struska	
Involve parents in ELA achievement with at-home learning opportunities - Larrabee/R.Dail	
Person Responsible	Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were 38% on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 38% to 43%.

Monitoring: Ongoing common, standard-aligned assessments.
Classroom visits, feedback, and support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie - Collective Teacher Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57
When it comes to student performance on reading and math tests, a teacher is estimated to have two to three times the impact of any other school factor, including services, facilities, and even leadership.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie - Collective Teacher Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing progress monitoring of Math achievement for all students. - Struska/Cortes
Classroom visits, feedback, and support. - Struska/Cortes/Larrabee/R.Dail
Professional development opportunities with ongoing monitoring and support for implementation. - Struska/Benito/Cortes/R.Dail/Larrabee
Provide daily Math enrichment and intervention for all students. - Struska
Involve parents in Math achievement with at-home learning opportunities - Larrabee/R.Dail

Person Responsible: Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Our primary area of concern with Very High rating was Violent Incidents. We had 6 total incidents. Our secondary area of concern with Very High rating was Drug/Public Order and we had 1 incident. These 7 total incidents are contained with just 3 students, so these are not pervasive concerns on our campus and the 3 students involved will be monitored and supported by the school counselor and a positive school culture and environment to encourage positive actions.

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.

At McInnis Elementary school we strive to create a positive school culture and environment for our students, teachers, families and staff. Identifying and addressing the academic, social-emotional, and personal needs of our students is our focus. We achieve this by building relationships based on mutual respect. We foster a culture that promotes confidence and empowerment by motivating and guiding our students with the highest expectations, in order to be successful. We recognize the importance of each person involved in this process and value it.

Throughout the school year our administration maintains direct connection and communication with parents, in English and Spanish through Facebook, Twitter, School Messenger and Microsoft TEAMS. In an effort to connect with our students and faculty each month, we will be meeting with Bobcat Leaders, students and faculty members that represent each grade level to find out what they think and identify needs. Faculty and students will complete the Panorama survey three times this school year; also, staff and parents will complete the School Climate Survey to know their opinion about our school culture and climate. Our school leadership team will analyze the data from these surveys and will identify strategies to address and build a positive school culture and environment with students, teachers, parents and staff. In McInnis we are compromised in helping our school community to reach their academic and social-emotional goals.

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

Stakeholders closest to the school include our students, teachers, parents, volunteers, school district, and school board members. Each one employs strategies based on our Schoolwide Improvement Plan to impact our school culture and environment. To achieve our goals it is important to integrate several groups from our community in this process. In fact, McInnis is distinguished by integrating our community to be part of this effort to create a positive school environment that encourages success for our students. Our community partners play an important role in meeting many of our students as well as their families needs. Some of these collaborators include DeLeon Spring Association, Sparton, Christian Church of DeLeon Springs, VolusiaSchool Fuel, Food Brings Hope, universities, and community colleges.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00