

Volusia County Schools

Manatee Cove 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Douglas D

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2016

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 (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">73%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">52%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Each one of us in the Manatee Cove family will work together to create a safe haven for learning where all can reach their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We at Manatee Cove Elementary believe:

- in committing to high expectations which embrace progress and change while providing the opportunities for continuous physical, emotional, social and intellectual development.
- it is the responsibility of the school community to create a safe haven physically and emotionally for all.
- developing a love for learning and the discovery of new concepts will set the stage for all future educational endeavors.
- that a school community should embrace cultural diversity, a spirit of learning, mutual caring and respect.
- that all success and achievement should be recognized and celebrated.
- open communication and the involvement of students staff, families and community are vital to the school.

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
Sojka, Michelle	Principal	The Manatee Cove Elementary School Leadership Team (SLT) includes administration, our instructional coaches, and K-12 and ESE teachers. We are a collaborative team which reviews data identifying strengths and weaknesses in order to create attainable goals for our school improvement plan. In addition, the SLT discusses strategies and action steps for implementation of said plan.
Cook-Grant, Tiffanee	Assistant Principal	
Crane, Katherine	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Benson-Culver, Michele	Teacher, K-12	
Blix, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Cascio, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach; will help implement action steps for ELA Area of Focus
LUEBBERT, RACHEAL	Other	
Robertson, Jeffrey	Teacher, ESE	
Staudte, Danielle	Other	
Willard, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach; will help implement the action steps for these areas of focus.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 12/1/2016, Alicia Douglas D

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

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

727

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

15

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

21

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	136	103	147	140	95	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	748
Attendance below 90 percent	127	31	41	53	23	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
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	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	38	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	17	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	2	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

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	67	105	87	81	93	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	4	20	14	5	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	18	13	11	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	2	2	16	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	67	105	87	81	93	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	4	20	14	5	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	18	13	11	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	2	2	16	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				61%	56%	57%	61%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	54%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	46%	53%	40%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	59%	63%	70%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	56%	62%	64%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	43%	51%	50%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				64%	57%	53%	66%	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	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	59%	16%	64%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
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 the Science section, the number represents the total number of students tested (this number consists of more than one assessment)/ Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	120/25.83%	130/36.9%	144/56.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	91/23.08%	98/28.57%	106/51.89%
	Students With Disabilities	18/5.56%	20/15.0%	24/33.33%
	English Language Learners	16/25%	17/23.53%	19/47.37%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	115/20.87%	124/20.97%	144/47.22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	87/18.39%	93/16.13%	104/39.42%
	Students With Disabilities	18/5.56%	19/0%	22/22.73%
	English Language Learners	15/20%	17/11.76%	19/40.86%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	93/29.03%	100/34.0%	113/44.25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/20.55%	80/26.25%	87/37.93%
	Students With Disabilities	14/14.29%	16/25%	15/60%
	English Language Learners	15/13.33%	15/13.33%	18/27.78%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	90/8.89%	94/19.15%	110/30.91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/5.71%	74/14.86%	82/24.39%
	Students With Disabilities	15/0%	14/14.29%	15/40%
	English Language Learners	13/7.69%	14/7.14%	16/12.50%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78/43.59%	97/48.45%	95/55.79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/39.06%	80/45%	79/51.9%
	Students With Disabilities	10/0%	14/7.14%	12/25%
	English Language Learners	13/23.08%	17/23.53%	16/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	74/14.86%	91/26.37%	87/41.38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/11.48%	73/20.55%	71/36.62%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.18%	12/16.67%	10/40%
	English Language Learners	13/7.69%	16/6.25%	14/0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	104/40.38%	119/43.70%	122/56.56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/38.10%	98/39.80%	95/56.84%
	Students With Disabilities	23/8.70%	31/19.35%	28/21.43%
	English Language Learners	24/29.17%	25/32%	24/41.67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	102/26.47%	112/41.96%	109/71.56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	82/24.39%	91/39.56%	86/69.77%
	Students With Disabilities	23/8.7%	29/20.69%	27/48.15%
	English Language Learners	24/8.33%	24/29.17%	23/56.52%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	112/39.82%	119/41.18%	122/40.24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75/28.95%	79/34.18%	81/33.33%
	Students With Disabilities	14/7.14%	16/12.5%	17/8.33%
	English Language Learners	20/25%	21/14.29%	22/19.35%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	112/35.71%	117/36.75%	133/55.64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/28.38%	77/29.87%	92/48.91%
	Students With Disabilities	14/7.14%	16/6.25%	17/17.65%
	English Language Learners	19/15.79%	20/20%	24/37.50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	532/61%	440/65%	207/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	349/57%	293/56%	130/76%
	Students With Disabilities	62/14%	52/50%	16/43%
	English Language Learners	95/32%	78/42%	33/71%

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	22	29		35	43	45	8				
ELL	39	38		33	31		31				
BLK	54	45		42	36		42				
HSP	47	55	10	36	45	45	41				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	63	57	36	61	64		68				
FRL	53	49	26	47	49	45	51				
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	18	28	24	30	36	26	26				
ELL	33	62	69	36	35	18	57				
BLK	53	39		70	52		40				
HSP	51	60	50	54	44	14	59				
MUL	68	58		80	75						
WHT	64	51	32	67	56	45	70				
FRL	54	48	36	58	49	32	56				
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	18	29	33	30	44	44	31				
ELL	29	50	46	46	73	83					
BLK	42	50		52	36	36	50				
HSP	54	40	25	65	72	77	58				
MUL	57	58		62	46						
WHT	66	60	43	75	68	48	70				
FRL	53	49	42	64	60	49	59				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	42
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	69
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	58
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	47
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 decreased in both ELA and math for 3rd (-13 ELA; -29 math) and 5th grade (-5 ELA; -6 Math); 4th grade ELA was flat (60%) and dropped -12. Science Achievement for 5th grade was down (-7) . MCE did make learning gains in both ELA and Math as well as an increase in math lowest quartile. MCE made gains in our SWD subgroup in both ELA (+2) and Math (+3) Achievement as well as our large gains among the Math Lowest Quartile (+19). Math Learning gains in this subgroup showed a +11 gain. There was, however, a significant drop in SWD gains in science (-19). Our African American subgroup increased in all areas of ELA and science. This subgroup dropped in math achievement (-28) and learning gains (-16). Math lowest quartile remained the same for this subgroup (25%).

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

Achievement in ELA, Math, and Science, as well as our ESSA subgroups Students with Disabilities and African Americans.

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 must include the effect of the Covid pandemic on staff and students. Interruptions to instruction, staffing issues, changing instructional platforms, and increased absences are just some

of the detrimental effects. MCE lost Title I funding for the 2020-21 school year which meant a loss of intervention teachers, technology, and other programs. In addition, our school was without a guidance counselor until late April. As a result, our students did not have the SEL and guidance lessons or PST and attendance support which they needed.

The Covid pandemic will continue to be a challenge in the coming school year. MCE regained its Title I standing. These funds will provide our students with two intervention teachers, one focusing on ELA and the other on math and science. MCE also has a Guidance Counselor and a renewed focus on SEL and attendance PSTs.

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

We showed improvement in ELA learning gains, math lowest quartile, and math learning gains.

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

New and/ or refocused attention to small groups in ELA; targeted professional learning for implementation; walk-to-intervention in 4th and 5th grade; student data chats.

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

Professional Learning; PLC conversations; coaching cycles; student goals and self-monitoring
Implement curriculum resources (Benchmark Advance, Envision) with fidelity.

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.

Cooperative Learning and Collaborative Structures; i-Ready training in student data chats; teacher training on teacher clarity; related to DOJ settlement for SWD (ASPECTS Training)

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

Targeted small group instruction
increase opportunities for enrichment and intervention
new coach and intervention for math and science; reading coach and intervention to support ELA
Utilizing teachers as leaders to share best practices

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 58% (-3%);our ELA Learning Gains was 56% (+3%), and the Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were 25% (-12%). Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile students in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWD).
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 25% to 41% Increase ELA Learning Gains from 56% to 59% Increase ELA Achievement from 58% to 62%
Monitoring:	Administration walk-throughs, review i-Ready and district assessment data at PLC meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction. Teacher Clarity Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75. The average effect size is 0.40. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 next

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to create master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE, and ESOL support.
2. Facilitate Professional Learning on Small Group Instruction
3. Professional Learning on Teacher Clarity
4. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data
5. Conduct PLCs monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions.
6. Conduct progress monitoring meetings with ESE and ELL Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.
7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in implementing standards-aligned instruction and effective implementation of best practice
8. Intervention Teacher for Reading using Title I funds
9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and

feedback

10. Purchased Ready Reading for intervention and Sadlier Vocabulary

11. Adhere to walk to intervention plan

Person
Responsible Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus Description & Rationale: Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Mathematics Proficiency was at 53% (-13), our Learning Gains percentage was 56% (+1), and our Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were 38% (+2). Our SLT decided to focus on Mathematics Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWD).
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable outcome: Increase Mathematics Lowest Quartile from 38% to 41%. Increase Mathematics Learning Gains from 56% to 62% Increase Mathematics Achievement from 53% to 55%
Monitoring:	Administration walk-throughs, review i-Ready and district assessment data at PLC meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher facilitated Number Talks and Problem-Solving Tasks. Teacher clarity. Number Talks encourage the students to engage in discussion and self questioning which have effect sizes of 0.82 and 0.64 respectively. Effect Sizes for Concentration/Persistence/Engagement and Cooperative vs. Individualistic Learning are 0.48 and 0.59 respectively.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75. The average effect size is 0.40. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 next

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to create a master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE, and ESOL support
2. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data
3. Conduct data chats at PLCs focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions
4. Conduct monitoring meetings with ESE and ELL teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.
5. Professional development on Number Talks
6. Professional development on Teacher Clarity
7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in implementing standards-aligned instruction and effective implementation of best practice
8. Intervention Teacher for Math/Science using Title I funds
9. Monitor implementation of differentiated instruction for identified students through ongoing Administrative Walk-throughs & feedback

Person Responsible Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Science Proficiency was at 59%, a -5% change from the prior administration. Further analysis revealed that proficiency for students in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities, was 7% (-26% from 2019). Our ESSA subgroup African Americans increase (+2).

Measurable Outcome: Increase targeted subgroup Students with Disabilities from 7% proficiency to 41%. Increase science proficiency from 59% to 62%.

Monitoring: Administration walk-throughs, review district assessment data at PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: VE-mild student inclusion in the general education classroom for science. Teacher Clarity

The average effect sizes range from 0.08 to 0.44 (ASCD), for special-needs students educated in regular classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75. The average effect size is 0.40. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. 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 next

Action Steps to Implement

Action Steps:

1. VE-Mild students will transition to general education science instruction when appropriate.
2. Professional development for classroom teachers from District Program Specialists on inclusion strategies and support for Students with Disabilities.
3. Professional development for classroom science teachers from District Content Specialists. PD should include focused training on the fair game benchmarks from the third and fourth grade standards.
4. New Academic Coach and Intervention Teacher to support science instruction.

Person Responsible Michelle Sojka (masojka@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.

A look at our attendance and discipline revealed the following: the average days absent for each student in the 2020-21 year was 15.46. While attendance is always a concern, the elevated number was to be expected during the pandemic.

Our total suspensions out of school was 249, an increase over past years. This places our school well above the state rate of suspensions per 100 students and is our primary area of concern. We will increase our focus on SEL through SEL lessons, our House system, and guidance interventions.

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.

Continued focus on SEL curriculum; work with guidance for whole group instruction. Dedicate one social studies lesson per week for SEL. SEL is incorporated into some ELA units.

Renewed focus on House System.

AVID focus on College and Career Readiness (grades 3-5)

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

Our PTA, SAC and school provide family involvement opportunities for the families of our students in the following ways: Meet the teacher day, open house night, PTA family events, i.e. game night, Father, Daughter Dance, Winter Carnival, end of year celebration, Monster Mash,, Movie Nights, Chick-Fil-A night, Moe's and Texas Roadhouse Night.

Other events include: Science night with The Museum of Arts and Sciences and Math Night; Multicultural Night; Social Studies Night; Science Fair Information Night; SAC Input night; Story Book Parade; Quarterly Celebration Assemblies.

Some of the events listed above were impacted by the pandemic. Events such as Meet the Teacher and Open House were held virtually. Other in-person events were not held. We expect some of these events will be impacted this school year as well.

Weekly school messages would go out to inform stakeholders of weekly events. The Cove Chronicle is our newsletter.

We share information on Twitter and Facebook and Class Story via Class Dojo.

Part V: Budget

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

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