

Volusia County Schools

Beachside Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Beachside Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

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

Demographics

Principal: Leigh Prokop M

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 KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Beachside Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/osceola/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 KG-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

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

Through the cooperation of all, our students shall acquire the knowledge, wisdom and ethics which will enable them to be productive citizens in an ever-changing global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Beachside Elementary teachers, staff, parents and community members work together to help develop an extraordinary whole child. We strive to offer personalized learning activities that value character development along with meeting the demands of the rigorous Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

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
Bruner, Lynn	Principal	The principal oversees the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school.
Cleveland, Melissa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in overseeing the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school.
Green, Gay	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will collaborate with teachers to support academic achievement for all students. The instructional coach will guide PLC Meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught.
French, Ashley	Other	The Math Coach will provide academic intervention in math with identified students.
Ferrari, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The ESE teacher Coach will service ESE students using standards aligned instruction.
Via, Julie	Teacher, K-12	The Kindergarten Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.
Stoner, Amy	Teacher, K-12	The First Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.
Gilbert, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	The Second Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction. The SAC Chair will conduct monthly SAC meetings, share relevant information with all stakeholders, write the SIP, and ensure all SAC deadlines are met.
Fischer, Kim	Teacher, K-12	The Fourth Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Treur, Deb	Teacher, K-12	The Fifth Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.
Campanella, Gina	Other	The Administrative Teacher on Assignment assists the principal in overseeing the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school.
White, Yahaira	Teacher, K-12	The ELA Coach will provide academic intervention in ELA with identified students.
Depasquale, Jane	Teacher, K-12	The Third Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.
Rowe, Sydney	School Counselor	The School Guidance Counselor will meet with administration to review data and PST instructional plans. She will provide support to staff and students as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Leigh Prokop 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.*

12

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.*

34

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

584

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

2

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

8

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	84	94	98	102	88	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	564
Attendance below 90 percent	26	33	36	35	36	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	2	0	1	6	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/9/2021

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	44	61	55	64	59	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	6	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	44	61	55	64	59	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	6	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				51%	56%	57%	58%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	46%	53%	20%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	59%	63%	65%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	56%	62%	51%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	43%	51%	31%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	57%	53%	64%	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	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85/18.82%	108/31.48%	101/55.45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69/15.94%	86/26.74%	79/48.10%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0.00%	11/0.00%	12/33.33%
	English Language Learners	2/0.00%	2/0.00%	2/50.0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/14.61%	93/30.11%	100/63.00%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/12.33%	75/24.00%	77/57.14%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8.33%	11/9.09%	12/50.0%
	English Language Learners	2/0.00%	2/0.00%	2/36.05%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89/26.97%	100/43.00%	101/52.48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/25.68%	85/37.65%	80/47.50%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0.00%	16/6.25%	12/16.67%
	English Language Learners	5/0.00%	6/16.67%	6/33.33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89/12.36%	98/29.59%	93/47.31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/9.46%	83/22.89%	74/44.59%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0.00%	12/0.00%	11/45.45%
	English Language Learners	5/0.00%	6/16.67%	5/20.00%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/41.98%	93/65.59%	93/67.74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/39.39%	76/61.84%	73/67.12%
	Students With Disabilities	18/11.11%	22/31.82%	20/30.00%
	English Language Learners	2/0.00%	3/66.67%	3/66.67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	79/12.66%	87/39.08%	86/60.47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/10.61%	70/37.14%	68/60.29%
	Students With Disabilities	17/11.76%	20/25.00%	17/35.29%
	English Language Learners	2/0.00%	2/0.00%	3/0.00%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	88/34.09%	111/35.14%	112/39.29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/27.40%	93/31.18%	88/36.36%
	Students With Disabilities	14/15.29z5	21/4.76%	22/4.55%
	English Language Learners	7/42.86%	14/28.57%	8/50.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	93/9.68%	106/33.02%	103/46.60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78/8.97%	89/30.34%	82/43.90%
	Students With Disabilities	14/0.00%	22/9.09%	19/15.79%
	English Language Learners	7/14.29%	9/33.33%	10/40.00%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	92/33.70%	90/40.0%	94/44.12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/32.47%	75/35.00%	77/38.10%
	Students With Disabilities	13/7.69%	13/20.0%	14/6.25%
	English Language Learners	6/33.33%	6/40.00%	6/66.67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	93/17.20%	93/40.68%	96/53.13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78/14.10%	78/35.90%	80/48.75%
	Students With Disabilities	13/0.00%	13/7.69%	14/14.29%
	English Language Learners	6/16.67%	6/50.00%	6/50.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	411/46%	352/57%	184/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	336/42%	293/51%	154/55%
	Students With Disabilities	49/27%	49/33%	24/18%
	English Language Learners	30/50%	24/67%	12/50%

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	11	10		25	50						
BLK	38			33							
HSP	50			40							
WHT	56	69		61	77		61				
FRL	50	64	46	52	70	82	50				
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	10	32	29	12	38	35	13				
BLK	20			35	60						
MUL	36			36							
WHT	56	55	43	59	58	43	61				
FRL	44	47	39	44	53	45	44				
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	20	19	11	28	35	33	27				
BLK	38	30		27	55	55	20				
MUL	38			46							
WHT	62	56	27	72	52	16	67				
FRL	55	46	13	61	50	37	65				

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	62
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	65
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	59
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?

The trends that emerged across grade levels and subgroups were low proficiency rates in ELA and Math in fourth and second grade and in ELA in fifth grade. Our SWD did not meet proficiency school wide.

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

ELA 3rd grade achievement was 48% (-10 compared to state), 4th grade 51% (-7 compared to state), 5th grade 51 (-5 compared to state) and Math Achievement for all grade levels 3rd 38% (-24 compared to state), 4th 63 (-1 state), 5th grade 55 (-5 compared to state) and SWD show the greatest need for improvement with proficiency in ELA at 10 and Math at 12.

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

The contributing factors were distance learning, behavior concerns and low attendance rates.

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

Math LQ and ELA LQ showed the most improvement. In ELA our lowest quartile went from 20% in 2018 to 42% in 2019; Math LQ from 31% to 45%.

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

Having a Math Intervention Teacher and committed time in master schedule for intervention, as well as morning and afternoon tutoring were contributing factors.

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

We will teach standard's aligned instruction to the rigor of the standard, increase student engagement, schedule designated intervention/enrichment times and provide intervention teachers.

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.

Teachers will be provided professional development on BEST standards, teacher clarity, standard aligned lesson planning and SEL/PBIS.

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

We will provide tutoring to identified students, schedule intervention teachers for time to work with multiple grade levels and provide mentoring to our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Needs Assessment Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency on FSA (averaged between both feeder schools, Ortona and Osceola) was at 52% for 3rd grade, 39% for 4th grade, and 50.5% for 5th grade. Further analysis revealed that our SWD subgroup decreased in all ELA components. Our Needs Assessment Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency on iReady was at 55.45% for 1st grade and 52.48% for 2nd grade. Our SLT has decided to focus on Standards Aligned ELA Instruction in order to improve overall proficiency for all. Individually Ortona had 50% or more score below a level 3 in 4th (33%) and 5th (45%) grade. Ocala had 4th grade score 46% proficient (below the 50%).
Measurable Outcome:	As we blend these two schools we will work to increase ELA proficiency from an average of the two schools; 52% to 60% for 3rd grade, from 39% to 50% for 4th grade, and from 50.5% to 60% for 5th grade. Increase overall ELA proficiency to 60%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, 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 effect 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria in every classroom to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning 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 Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: What is it we expect our students to learn? How will we know if our students are learning? How will we respond when students do not learn? How will we respond when students have learned?

Person Responsible Lynn Bruner (blbruner@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.

Person Responsible Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Needs Assessment Analysis revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 58% (Osceola) and 39% (Ortona), an average of 48.9% which is below the district and state average in previous years. Further analysis revealed that our ESSA subgroups increased in many Math components but are still below district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Standards Aligned Math Instruction in order to improve overall proficiency for all.

Measurable Outcome: Increase overall Math proficiency from 48.9% to 62%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific Math look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, 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 effect 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 Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria in every classroom to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning 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 Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: What is it we expect our students to learn? How will we know if our students are learning? How will we respond when students do not learn? How will we respond when students have learned?

Person Responsible Lynn Bruner (blbruner@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.

Person Responsible Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Needs Assessment Analysis revealed that our Science Proficiency was at 57% (Osceola) and 48% (Ortona) for an average of 52.5% which is below the district, but above the state average. Further analysis revealed that our SWD subgroups performed at 11% (Osceola) and 50% (Ortona). Our AA subgroup performed at 29% (Osceola) and 20% (Ortona). Our SLT has decided to focus on Standards Aligned Science Instruction in order to improve overall proficiency for all.

Measurable Outcome: Increase overall Science proficiency to 62%.
Increase our ESSA subgroup's Science proficiency to 50%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific Science look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, 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 effect 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 Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria in every classroom to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning 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 Lynn Bruner (blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: What is it we expect our students to learn? How will we know if our students are learning? How will we respond when students do not learn? How will we respond when students have learned?

Person Responsible Lynn Bruner (blbruner@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.

Person Responsible Gay Green (gagreene@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.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified total reported suspensions as an area of concern. Our ranking was 1,241 out of 1,395 statewide and 37/126 county wide. It is ranked as very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will:

- identify mentors for students with high numbers of suspensions
- provide incident data to teachers monthly at faculty meetings
- review and update school wide character traits
- continue PBIS, including our House system

Teachers will:

- continue to use PBIS strategies, including sand dollars and House points
- embed SEL activities into core curriculum instruction

Data chats will take place monthly at Leadership Team meetings and quarterly at faculty meetings to discuss the implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on the 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.

SEL

Beachside Elementary School offers a variety of SEL programs/opportunities including:

- Mentoring
- SEL lessons integrated in our curriculum
- School wide Soft Skills Expectations (developed by Beachside staff)
- Whole and Small Group Lessons with the Guidance Counselor
- Houses
- Beachside PRIDE awards
- Staff book study focusing on positive school culture (Relentless)

Violence Prevention Programs

Beachside Elementary School offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:

- Student Mentoring Program
- Peer Mediation Program
- Suicide Prevention Program
- Bullying Program
- DARE
- Girls on the Run Program

Nutrition Programs

Beachside Elementary School offers a variety of nutrition programs including:

- Free and Reduced Meal Plan
- Wellness Policy School Plan
- Nutrition and Wellness classes
- Health classes
- Personal Fitness classes
- Girls on the Run Program
- Changes Program

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

Beachside Elementary School builds and sustains partnerships with the local community by holding the following events:

- * Meet the Teacher- Various extended day providers are invited to set up a booth to share information.
- * Open House- PTA sets up a booth to promote membership amongst parents, grandparents, business partners and community members. Volunteers and Business Partners are invited to assist with and set up booths to share information.
- * Volunteer/Business Partner Appreciation Breakfast-Beachside offers a breakfast to thank all our parents, grandparents, business partners, and community members who have supported our school throughout the school year.
- * Family/Curriculum Nights held on campus and at off-site locations. Volunteers and Business Partners are invited to share information.
- * Beachside hosts an event to honor DARE officers.
- * Beachside has been adopted by Daytona Beach Hilton which has earned grants on behalf of Beachside.
- * Beachside partners with Hard Rock Hotel, local churches, Food Brings Hope, and Provision Packs to feed and clothe our students and families who are in need.
- * Beachside participates in the District's FACT Fair.
- * Beachside participates in the District's School Choice Fair.
- * Beachside Gives Back- an event to prepare fifth grade students to Give Back to the community in which they live by demonstrating necessary social skills for the work force.

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: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00