

Volusia County Schools

George W. Marks 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

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

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Young

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/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	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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 cooperative support of the school, family, and community, our students will develop academic and citizenship skills to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

George Marks Elementary, where everyone succeeds together!

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
Priddy, Becky	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair, SIP
YOUNG, SHANNON	Principal	
Westervelt, Amanda	School Counselor	
Van Slyke, Shannon	Assistant Principal	
Heffernan, Jill	Teacher, K-12	
Simon, Diane	Teacher, K-12	
Hurst, Janet	Teacher, K-12	
Rosekelly, Lori	Teacher, ESE	
Adkins, Colleen	Instructional Media	
Susid, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	
Moncelsi, Renee	Teacher, K-12	
Haughwout, Katie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Shannon Young

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

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

698

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

1

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

10

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	121	124	110	140	105	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	21	26	17	17	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	18	3	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/6/2021

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	58	81	95	92	82	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	11	8	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	3	4	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	6	3	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	58	81	95	92	82	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	11	8	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	3	4	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	6	3	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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				59%	56%	57%	53%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	46%	53%	42%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	59%	63%	57%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	56%	62%	48%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	43%	51%	41%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	57%	53%	59%	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	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District OPMs, VSTs

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80	73	80
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	50	63	61
	English Language Learners	73	68	77
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	80	82
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	44	64	57
	English Language Learners	67	80	84

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	58	80
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	27	27	61
	English Language Learners	56	56	77
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83	89	80
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	62	92	71
	English Language Learners	73	77	59
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	56	69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	30	35	43
	English Language Learners	26	35	41
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	69	45
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	52	30
	English Language Learners	0	56	17

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	73	40
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	40	30
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	40	57
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	33
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	36	39
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	17	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	53	23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	45	15
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	21	22
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	4
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	23	26
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	17	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	35	41
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	33
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	73	40
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	40	30
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	40	57
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	33
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	36	39
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	17	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	53	23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	45	15
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	21	22
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	4
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	23	26
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	17	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	35	41
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	33

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	23	35	44	17	13	14	22				
ELL	32	42	46	29	30	9	29				
BLK	8			17							
HSP	41	45	47	37	34	15	27				
MUL	60										
WHT	66	45		60	54		77				
FRL	47	45	48	42	38	15	48				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	31	38	27	50	46	14				
ELL	46	35		51	42						
BLK	45	57		42	55		36				
HSP	49	39	30	53	44	27	50				
MUL	38			31							
WHT	65	57	52	66	70	57	53				
FRL	53	49	44	52	52	37	40				
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	21	34	33	26	39	41	30				
ELL	31	48	46	43	59	45	23				
BLK	50	43		56	40						
HSP	44	54	38	46	46	37	44				
MUL	20			40							
WHT	57	50	38	60	50	39	67				
FRL	44	42	38	50	45	36	49				

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	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	35
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	13
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	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	60
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?

The lowest quartile dropped in FSA Math, ELA and Science in ESSA category SWD. AA also showed a drop in ELA achievement, math achievement, math learning gains, lowest quartile and science achievement.

Fourth grade and fifth grade all scored lower than the district average on assessments in ELA. Third grade and fifth grade scored below the district average in math assessments.

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

The greatest need for improvement would be in math and ELA lowest quartile in ESSA subgroup SWD and ESSA subgroup AA in ELA and math achievement, math learning gains, math lowest quartile and science achievement.

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

Contributing factors would include attendance issues and modes of learning changes all due to the pandemic that caused gaps in student's learning.

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

The most improvement was shown in fourth grade ELA achievement and fifth grade science achievement.

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

A school-wide STEM special area was added where a focus was made on fifth grade standards and fair game standards. Fourth grade improvements were made due to instructional coaching, planning and progress monitoring with forth grade teachers,

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

Data will be reviewed with all stakeholders. Power components will be selected for math intervention at every grade level with specific ongoing progress monitoring. ELA with also be addressed later in the year as it isn't as pressing.

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 receive professional development in Number Talks. This will include a make and take to prep for NT meetings. The PD will also have an emphasis on student talk. Teachers will be involved in the selection of the power components and trained on the progress monitoring assessments used. Teachers will also receive diversity training, Autism awareness professional development and professional development on the 5E model (with make and take hands on investigation lesson planning).

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

We will participate in the Food for Hope program. This will provide weekly food, intervention and enrichment, and experiences outside the school day to students who normally would not get those experiences (trips etc).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus aligns to strategic plan #1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it revealed that our math proficiency was 50% with the math lowest quartile scoring at 14% which is below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most students in the lowest quartile were also in ESSA subgroups SWD and AA that performed 14%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase math proficiency from 50% to 55%. Increase LQ learning gains from 14% to 41% (pre pandemic goals), including ESSA subgroups SWD and AA.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthrough tools with specific math look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through walk through observations and student data. Persons responsible: Shannon Young, Shannon Van Slyke, Julie Murray

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence based strategy is response to intervention. 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 student's learning and determining next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Response to intervention has an affect size of 1.07 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 1.07, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when response to intervention is implemented with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

Share data with faculty that determined SIP goals and the need for response to intervention

Person Responsible Becky Priddy (rfpriddy@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide PD in Number Talks with a make and take and a emphasis on student talk

Person Responsible Becky Priddy (rfpriddy@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Disaggregate data to determine math power components (this will take place during PLC and in ERPLS with each grade level including math intervention teacher, ESE teachers and classroom teachers)

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Tutoring outside the school day based on the math power components

Person Responsible Laura Manning (lemannin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Intervention time for math on the master schedule for every classroom teacher

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Goal setting with data in each classroom

Person
Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ASD and diversity professional development

Person
Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus aligns to strategic plan #1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency was 54% with the ELA lowest quartile scoring at 46% which is below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most students in the lowest quartile were also in ESSA subgroups SWD and performed at 44%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA proficiency from 54% to 60%. Increase LQ learning gains from 46% to 55%, including ESSA subgroups SWD.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthrough tools with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through walk through observations and student data. Persons responsible: Shannon Young, Shannon Van Slyke, Julie Murray

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@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 student's learning and determining next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher Clarity has an affect size of .75 (Hattie, 2009). The average effect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .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 success criteria with students
- ensure alignment of lesson, tasks and assignments
- ensure lesson delivery is relevant, accurate, understandable to students
- provide feedback on where to move next

Action Steps to Implement

Share data with faculty that determined SIP goals and the need for teacher clarity specifically in reference to learning targets

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Disaggregate data to determine ELA "targeted high needs intervention benchmarks" (this will take place during PLC and in ERPLS with each grade level including ELA intervention teachers, ESE teachers and classroom teachers)

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School and district based PD on new Benchmark Advance reading curriculum

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School/district PD on BEST standards and roll-out implementation

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ELA intervention time for every classroom teacher on the master schedule

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Addition of 2 ELA intervention teachers to the faculty that will address ELA "targeted high needs benchmarks"

Person Responsible Amanda Cone (akcone@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ASD and diversity PD

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurrap@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.

We will monitor suspensions for SWD. We will complete DOJ training for all staff, diversity PD, and ASD PD in order to reduce the suspension rate in SWD. SWD suspensions will be monitored frequently using reports, administrators, ESE teachers and school counselors to help intervene.

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.

GME addresses a positive school culture by daily SEL time, PBIS (BARK rules and school wide incentive system), and professional learning designed to promote a positive school culture.

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

Parents, students and faculty and staff are involved. We also involve PTA and SAC to assist in involving parents and community members through monthly free events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00