R. J. Longstreet Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. J. Longstreet Elementary School

2745 S PENINSULA DR, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

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

Demographics

Principal: Lynn Bruner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (49%)
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

R. J. Longstreet Elementary School

2745 S PENINSULA DR, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/rjlongstreet/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	44%

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.

R. J. Longstreet, in partnership with our community, will empower students to become compassionate, lifelong learners who are responsible, productive and engaged citizens within our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students strive to achieve their maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring and challenging learning environment.

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
Haubrich, Melissa	Principal	The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.
Scaccia, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.
Schuld, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
McCarty, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Rajcooar, Christina	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Johnston, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Corhern, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Legath, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Henderson, Marge	Instructional Coach	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Marcus, Sarah	School Counselor	The school counselor provides for the social-emotional competencies of all students through school counseling efforts and programs.
Biggs, Joe	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Hogan, Dianna	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/6/2020, Lynn Bruner

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.*
16

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.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
27

Total number of students enrolled at the school
360

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.
1

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	26	55	24	37	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	1	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	2	5	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	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	0	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

Thursday 8/5/2021

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	77	60	58	73	66	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	17	11	10	9	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	1	6	1	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	4	9	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	7	8	4	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	77	60	58	73	66	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	17	11	10	9	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	1	6	1	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	4	9	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	7	8	4	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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				62%	56%	57%	58%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	46%	53%	44%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	59%	63%	49%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	56%	62%	42%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	43%	51%	26%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				58%	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	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	59%	0%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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.

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment. For Science, we used VST data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/19.72%	88/32.95%	73/47.95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/20.34%	74/25.68%	59/40.68%
	Students With Disabilities	14/7.14%	17/5.88%	16/6.25%
	English Language Learners	4/25.00%	6/50.00%	7/42.86%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70/19.72%	83/31.33%	70/44.29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/22.41%	69/26.09%	56/42.86%
	Students With Disabilities	15/6.67%	17/11.76%	15/0.00%
	English Language Learners	4/25.00%	7/14.29%	6/33.62%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47/21.28%	51/50.98%	57/49.12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/18.92%	38/44.74%	41/46.34%
	Students With Disabilities	9/0.00%	8/12.50%	10/10.00%
	English Language Learners	8/0.00%	8/37.50%	8/50.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47/8.51%	54/18.52%	56/42.86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/10.81%	40/20.00%	40/37.50%
	Students With Disabilities	9/0.00%	10/0.00%	9/11.11%
	English Language Learners	8/0.00%	8/12.50%	8/50.00%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	44/43.18%	49/65.31%	52/67.31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/40.54%	41/60.98%	42/61.90%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0.00%	4/25.00%	4/0.00%
	English Language Learners	1/0.00%	2/0.00%	2/0.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	43/18.60%	50/30.00%	49/65.31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/11.11%	42/19.05%	40/60.00%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0.00%	5/0.00%	4/0.00%
	English Language Learners	1/0.00%	2/0.00%	2/0.00%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	46/41.30%	58/44.83%	63/52.38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/29.73%	44/38.64%	46/50.00%
	Students With Disabilities	7/14.29%	11/9.09%	8/25.00%
	English Language Learners	3/33.33%	4/0.00%	3/0.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	43/20.93%	49/40.82%	59/49.15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/14.71%	38/36.84%	45/44.44%
	Students With Disabilities	7/0.00%	9/22.22%	8/37.50%
	English Language Learners	3/0.00%	3/0.00%	5/0.00%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/43.90%	44/54.00%	44/62.22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/44.12%	35/50.00%	32/54.55%
	Students With Disabilities	5/20.00%	6/33.33%	5/40.00%
	English Language Learners	4/25.00%	4/25.00%	4/25.00%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/30.00%	45/53.33%	51/74.51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/21.21%	36/47.22%	38/73.68%
	Students With Disabilities	5/0.00%	7/14.29%	6/50.00%
	English Language Learners	4/25.00%	5/40.00%	6/50.00%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	164/68%	157/72%	133/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	136/67%	126/68%	102/82%
	Students With Disabilities	14/33%	15/40%	14/60%
	English Language Learners	16/25%	16/25%	11/75%

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	33			20							
ELL											
BLK	41			52							
HSP	38			31							
WHT	69	60		73	71		83				
FRL	54	52		54	58		68				
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	21	29	33	30	42	35	27				
ELL	36	60		45	55						
BLK	37	38		33	46						
HSP	50	62		38	56		30				

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
MUL	65	47		58	53						
WHT	68	57	52	61	58	45	59				
FRL	56	54	53	47	50	38	51				
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	26	52	42	23	33	20	39				
ELL	23			38	55						
BLK	21	28	27	25	20		18				
HSP	41	62		47	43						
MUL	65	57		45	50						
WHT	64	59	44	52	46	30	72				
FRL	52	55	42	43	40	27	62				

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	64
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
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	58
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?

FSA 4th grade decreased in both math and reading performance. AA increased. ELA LQ is our lowest performing area, for all students, SWD, and AA. Science data increased to 74% from 58%. Math achievement increased from 55% to 62%. Math LG increased from 56% to 66%. Math LQ increased from 38% to 43%. ELA achievement decreased from 62% to 59%. ELA LG increased from 54% to 56%. ELA LQ decreased from 50% to 14%. Our overall school grade increased from a C to an A. (53% to 63%).

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

ESSA Groups: ESE & SWD, LQ in both math and reading and ELA LG

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: Mobility, attendance and lack of SEL implementation.
New action: SEL implementation, system for attendance (attendance PST) and immediate support for incoming students.

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

Science from 58% to 74%, Math LG from 56% to 66% and Math achievement from 55% to 62%

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

Contributing factors: I&E blocks, student accountability, student data conferences, immediate walkthrough feedback (weekly) and focused PLC's.
New actions: I&E blocks (more flexible and standard focused intervention), weekly student data monitoring and instructional discussions in PLC's.

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

Systems for attendance, training on new curriculum and standards, individual student goals and data tracking sheets for all students.

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.

Benchmark training, Teacher Clarity: Success Criteria, ASPECTS Training, Diversity Training, Meeting the Diverse Needs of Students with Autism, PST Process

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

Vertical alignment, SEL classes from the counselor and Small Group Reading and Writing Support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our SWD proficiency was at 33% for ELA achievement, 50% for ELA learning gains, 0% for ELA LQ, 20% for Math achievement, 40% for Math learning gains, 33% for Math LQ, and 40% for Science achievement. This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase SWD overall proficiency from 37% to 43%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific SWD look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Weekly review of student data and instructional need in PLC's. Persons Responsible – Principal Melissa Haubrich and Coach Marge Henderson.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps. Student data will be reviewed weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1. Have appropriately high expectations. 2. Share their notions of success criteria with their students. 3. Ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4. Ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and 5. 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 and weekly review of student data.

Person Responsible	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@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 desire outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going, where are we now, how do we move learning forward, what do we learn today, who benefited and who did not?

Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work and data and identify students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use targeted phonics instruction daily for 45 minutes for students with foundational deficits.

Person Responsible Michelle Nelson (mlnelson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use targeted intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills.

Person Responsible Jennifer Johnston (jmjohnst@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor monthly progress monitoring and topic checks during PLCs.

Person Responsible Michelle Nelson (mlnelson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor classroom and ESE support facilitation small group instruction/schedules to ensure daily intervention for Tier 3 SWD.

Person Responsible Michelle Nelson (mlnelson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data chats in weekly PLCs.

Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA LQ was 0%. R.J. Longstreet did not meet the minimum number of ten students required for the 2020-2021 school year. This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA LQ proficiency from 0% to 54%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific ELA LQ look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Melissa Haubrich and Coach Marge Henderson.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1. Have appropriately high expectations. 2. Share their notions of success criteria with their students. 3. Ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4. Ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and 5. 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	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@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 desire outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: where are we going, where are we now, how do we move learning forward, what do we learn today, who benefited and who did not?

Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use targeted instruction daily for 30 minutes for all Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use targeted intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills.

Person Responsible Jennifer Johnston (jmjohnst@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor weekly the use of iReady data, SIPPS data, and Progress Monitoring.

Person Responsible Jennifer Johnston (jmjohnst@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Math LQ was 43%. This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math LQ proficiency from 43% to 54%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific Math LQ look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Melissa Haubrich and Coach Marge Henderson.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1. Have appropriately high expectations. 2. Share their notions of success criteria with their students. 3. Ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4. Ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students. 5. 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	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@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 desire outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going, where are we now, how do we move learning forward, what do we learn today, who benefited and who did not?

Person Responsible   Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible   Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use targeted instruction daily for 30 minutes for all tier 3 students.

Person Responsible   Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use targeted intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Johnston (jmjohnst@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor weekly the use of iReady data, Topic Checks, and Progress Monitoring.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Johnston (jmjohnst@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 hit/strike as an area of concern. It is ranked as very high (77 out of 241 incidents or 32% of total). Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School Counselor will teach social and communication skills to classrooms.

Teachers will utilize CHAMPS procedures. Teachers will develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without hitting or striking and monitor students closely when transitioning in the hallways and during recess.

Data chats will take place quarterly during faculty 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.

The school offers the following list to ensure the needs of all student are met:
*Sanford Harmony
*Bully Proofing Program
*Student Mentoring Program
*THRIVE Skills Instruction
*Cardinal Dads
*Cardinal Tweets
*School Resources Officer Mentor
*Community partnerships with Ponce Inlet Lions Club, Drive-In Church, and Food Brings Hope respond to the nutritional needs of our students.
*Community partnerships with Ponce Inlet Lions Club and Cherise's Salon respond to the clothing needs of our students.

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

Sarah Marcus- School Counselor
Joe Biggs- Kindergarten Teacher
Dianna Hogan- First Grade Teacher
Michelle McCarty- Second Grade Teacher
Jennifer Legath- Third Grade Teacher
Sheila Corhern- Fourth Grade Teacher
Christina Rajcooar- Fifth Grade Teacher
Marge Henderson- Instructional Coach
Cassandra Stewart- Media Teacher
Michelle Nelson- ESE Teacher
Melissa Haubrich- Principal
Kim Scaccia- Assistant Principal
Jennifer Johnston- Intervention Teacher

The school counselor will be teaching social and emotion lessons to all grade levels through out the school year. Lesson details will be shared with the above leadership team. Team leaders will share and discuss information with their departments or grade levels. Then, staff will be able to reinforce and utilize taught lessons when supporting students in the classrooms. As well, the need for specific lessons will be

determined at this meeting.

The school counselor will be offering support to small groups as well as individuals. All staff will provide input to what support lessons are needed as a whole school and /or grade level.

The above leadership team will meet monthly to review needed individual and small group support. The Assistant Principal, Counselor and Social Worker will meet weekly to review support for absences. Additionally, the Assistant Principal and the Counselor will meet weekly to review referrals and threat assessments.

Part V: Budget

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

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