Edgewater Public School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edgewater Public School

801 S OLD COUNTY RD, Edgewater, FL 32132

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

Demographics

Principal: Sharon Lavallee

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2021

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* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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

Edgewater Public School

801 S OLD COUNTY RD, Edgewater, FL 32132

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/edgewater/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	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	18%

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.

"All stakeholders at Edgewater Public will affect positive change in our school, community, and beyond as we develop our skills in communication, creativity, critical thinking and collaboration."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Through the shared responsibility of all, we will provide a safe learning environment that fosters commitment, collaboration, and creativity in a changing world."

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
Lavallee, Sharon	Principal	The school leadership team is responsible for creating, implementing and monitoring the school improvement plan.
Amato, Melanie	Instructional Coach	
Reshidat, Reem	Teacher, K-12	
Hillier, Karlee	Teacher, K-12	
Mowrey, Keri	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Robin	SAC Member	
Meador, Jennifer	Instructional Media	
Jones, Selina	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/9/2021, Sharon Lavallee

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

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

492

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.

4

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	76	79	79	85	72	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	6	17	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
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	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	9	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/18/2021

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	79	83	65	65	79	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	9	6	6	5	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	1	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	79	83	65	65	79	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	9	6	6	5	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	1	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				48%	56%	57%	51%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	46%	53%	30%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	59%	63%	62%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	56%	62%	58%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	43%	51%	36%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	57%	53%	55%	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	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	59%	5%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
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 assessment, FSA data for 5th grade science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	43%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	13%	31%	40%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	39%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11%	35%	40%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	55%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7%	7%	14%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	32%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7%	0%	7%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	69%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	55%	55%	52%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	43%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14%	25%	63%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	57%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	0%	18%	6%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	33%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	0%	6%	18%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	35%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	0%	7%	7%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	36%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	7%	7%	54%
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59.4%	63.8%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	18.2%	23.1%	24.3%
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

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
				2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS							
SWD	31	73	73	27	53		29				
MUL	18			45							
WHT	57	69	69	65	67	58	68				
FRL	49	53	54	59	63	60	58				

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
				2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS							
SWD	23	33	28	26	35	30	32				
BLK	23			31							
MUL	47			68							
WHT	50	49	29	56	52	38	58				
FRL	43	44	32	52	48	32	51				

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
				2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS							
SWD	29	41	29	29	39	30	35				
BLK	33			60							
MUL	45			45							
WHT	52	52	29	64	61	37	57				
FRL	49	49	28	61	54	31	53				

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
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?

SWD overall achievement needs improvement, 4th and 5th Grade ELA FSA Achievement

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

ELA FSA Achievement, VLT and Volusia Writes

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

SWD Lack of progress on virtual platform, attendance,

Increase attendance with support from Parent Liaison, Utilizing intervention resources from new ELA textbook, Teacher Clarity Book Study

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

ELA Lowest Quartile, Math Lowest Quartile, 5th Grade overall math achievement

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

Looping with students from fourth to fifth, targeted grade intervention, walk to intervention, Intervention teachers, after school tutoring focused on lowest quartile students

New actions include 2/3 teachers looping with students from 4th to 5th grade, targeted 4/5th grade intervention, math walk to intervention time, departmentalization among 2 teachers instead of 3 teachers which will help build better relationships between students and teachers.

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

Continue intervention using new instructional resources, after school tutoring, AVID implementation across grade levels

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.

Training on new ELA resource materials, Teacher Clarity Training, AVID training

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

Admin walk throughs, District and teacher learning walks, PLC, team planning, data days, vertical conversations, attendance tracking

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA overall achievement scores from FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	56% of our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students will achieve a 3 or higher on the FSA.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring, VLTs, IReady, Data Chats, Admin Walkthroughs, PLCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher-led small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for intervention support.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Facilitate PL on new Reading Curriculum

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Conduct weekly PLC meetings for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions.

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Conduct progress monitoring every 5-6 weeks with ESE and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Conduct data days with coaches and teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and Feedback.

| **Person Responsible** | Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

10. 6 Week- Intervention Groups with Intervention and classroom teachers

| **Person Responsible** | Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

11. Tutoring

| **Person Responsible** | Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	31% achievement in ELA, 27% in Math and 29% achievement in Science
Measurable Outcome:	Increase students with disability achievement in ELA, Math and Science to 41%.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring, VLTs, Data Chats, iReady
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted Small groups instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Facilitate PL on new Reading Curriculum

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Conduct weekly PLC meetings for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions.

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Conduct progress monitoring every 5-6 weeks with ESE and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Conduct data days with coaches and teachers.

Person Responsible   Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and Feedback.

Person Responsible   Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

10. 6 Week- Intervention Groups with Intervention and classroom teachers

Person Responsible   Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

11. Tutoring

Person Responsible   Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Inconsistent VST and Science Topic Check data.
Measurable Outcome:	Maintain 62% FSA Science overall achievement.
Monitoring:	Data Chats, Science Topic Checks, VST, PLCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based Instruction (Science and STEM Instruction)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 according to John Hattie. Hattie's research also shows that strategy to integrate with prior knowledge has an effect size of .93.

Action Steps to Implement	

1. Review of previous science district and state assessments.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer VST to 3-5th grade students.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Science Standards and STEM Process.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct progress monitoring meetings every 5-6 weeks to review data to plan instruction.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Data Days with coaches and teachers.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor science instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and feedback.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Meetings with DLTL for technology planning support.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coach meets with principal and PLC weekly, and Individual Teachers as aligned with District coaching model.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@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.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified disruptions on campus. It is ranked as high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will:
- create a Behavior Leadership/ SEL Team
- continue to implement Bobcat Powers Program
- work to build Mentor Program

Teachers will:
- continue SEL lessons
- recommend students for mentor program
- develop clear expectations with students to minimize classroom disruptions

Data chats will take place quarterly during faculty and PLC meetings to discuss the above 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.

Edgewater Public School will continue to build positive relationships by increasing our efforts to communicate with our families. We will do this by continued use of our monthly school newsletters and weekly School Messenger calls. We will also provide Title I parent nights to build parent content area knowledge. The nights will provide the expectations for FSA, and more in depth knowledge of what students are learning in class. We also will provide daycare to help families be able to participate in more Title I family nights.

Title I meetings include:
1. Title I Annual Meeting
2. Meet the teacher
3. Open House
4. STEM Family night

5. Science Fair
6. Mystery Family Night
7. Book Fair Night
8. Fort Night
9. STEM Night
10. Book Fair Night
11. Science Project Information Night.
12. Parent-to kid workshops and other parent education classes to teach literacy and math skills to parents so they can help their children succeed
13. Title I money is used to provide a Parent Liaison to help build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders.
14. Bi-weekly guidance lessons (SEL) in special area
15. SEL lessons in the classroom with teacher daily

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

Parents- Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Council (SAC) Members, communicate ideas with school
Teachers- Build relationships with students and families.
Principal- Build relationships with students, families, teachers and staff. Communicate with all stakeholders.
Staff- Build relationships with students and families.