Spirit Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Laura Figueroa

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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/spirit/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	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

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.

Spirit Elementary is committed to ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to become a responsible, productive citizen able to cope with changing social and economic conditions. The staff of Spirit Elementary strives to meet the individual needs of each student, taking into consideration their unique attributes and capabilities. High academic achievement by students is of the utmost concern to the school's primary stakeholders, which includes parents, teachers and administrators. Therefore, parental involvement is a key component to the success of our school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spirit believes we are the difference between what is and what could be for students.

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
Devaney, Carrie Ann	Principal	Leading systematic review of all available data throughout the year by school improvement team members to determine the progress of action steps and the effectiveness of identified steps in the action plan and progress toward the measurable outcome. The principal will work to eliminate barriers identified by the team through identified resources.
Robinson, Jamie	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mr. Robinson will assist in the systematic review of ongoing student and school data to evaluate the progress of action steps and progress toward measurable outcomes. Mr. Robinson will assist in reducing or eliminating identified barriers, and provide input to the team regarding barriers, resources, and examination of data.
GAETJENS, MICHELLE	Instructional Media	Ms. Gaetjens as an instructional technology specialist will assist in providing input on barriers, student data and current school performance levels. Ms. Gaetjens will assist in the use of technology to reach out to families about the instructional program. Ms. Gaetjens will assist in monitoring the progress of Spirit Elementary toward our school improvement goals and determine solutions to barriers to our success.
TUFARIELLO, DARLENE	Instructional Coach	Ms. Tufariello as an instructional coach will provide input into the barriers facing teachers and students. Ms. Tufariello will work with teachers and the SIP team members to examine the data, reflect on progress and monitor action steps. Ms. Tufariello will assist teachers with pedagogical strategies and techniques to improve instructional outcomes for students. Ms. Tufariello will implement a PLC structure that leads teachers through the examination of scaffolding instruction of upcoming standards and ensuring the depth of the standard is being taught to all learners.
Richards, Carol	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Richards as an instructional coach will provide input into the barriers facing teachers and students. Mrs. Ricahrds will work with teachers and the SIP team members to examine the data, reflect on progress and monitor action steps. Mrs. Richards will assist teachers with pedagogical strategies and techniques to improve instructional outcomes for students. She will help implement a PLC structure that leads teachers through the examination of scaffolding instruction of upcoming standards and ensuring the depth of the standard is being taught to all learners.
Morales-Torres, Nitza	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Morales as the English for Speakers of Other Languages specialist will ensure the examination of data to include ESOL students. In addition Ms. Morales will work with teachers to ensure this ESSA subgroup of students are being instructed using the WIDA Can Do Descriptors according to their DUESS date and WIDA levels if applicable. Ms. Morales will assist teachers in reviewing the progress data of our ESOL students, providing support with teaching practices and instructional accommodations to assist ESOL student in achieving a proficient understanding of the standards. In addition, Ms. Morales will monitor the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		action steps, provide input on barriers and successes and reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes.
French, Laura	Teacher, ESE	Ms. French as the Exceptional Student Education specialist will ensure the examination of data to include students with disabilities. In addition, Ms. French will work with teachers to ensure this ESSA subgroup of students are being instructed using the accommodations in their IEP's. Ms. French will assist teachers in reviewing the progress data of our ESE students, providing support with teaching practices and instructional accommodations to assist ESE students in achieving a proficient understanding of the standards. In addition, Ms. French will monitor the action steps, provide input on barriers and successes, and reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes of 42% or higher of ESE students achieving proficiency.
Hoskins, Danyel	Teacher, K-12	As an intervention specialist, Ms. Hoskins will lead the intervention team through the analysis of ongoing progress monitoring data for students who are not yet proficient in below grade-level standards. The intervention teachers will monitor our data and action steps to reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Laura Figueroa

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
49

Total number of students enrolled at the school
610

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

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	100	113	108	101	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	23	29	30	25	24	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
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	2	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	4	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	3	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/11/2021

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	64	87	79	83	84	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	64	87	79	83	84	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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				46%	56%	57%	48%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	46%	53%	44%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	59%	63%	49%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	56%	62%	59%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	43%	51%	41%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	57%	53%	56%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	59%	-18%	64%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	56%	-10%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment for Reading and Math completed 3 times per year (Fall, Winter, Spring) Science District Assessments for fifth grade.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90 / 27.78%	95 / 57.37%	95 / 68.42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76 / 27.63%	82 / 45.12%	78 / 66.67%
	Students With Disabilities	13 / 15.38%	15 / 13.33%	13 / 23.08%
	English Language Learners	35 / 22.86%	41 / 41.46%	39 / 69.23%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89 / 23.60%	95 / 30.53%	96 / 46.88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75 / 18.67%	81 / 29.63%	78 / 46.15%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 16.67%	15 / 13.33%	15 / 20.00%
	English Language Learners	37 / 21.62%	40 / 25.00%	40 / 48.21%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80 / 32.50%	99 / 42.42%	108 / 47.22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69 / 27.54%	86 / 38.37%	91 / 43.96%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 0%	22 / 9.09%	24 / 4.17%
	English Language Learners	30 / 20%	38 / 26.32%	40 / 35%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78 / 23.08%	97 / 27.84%	91 / 45.05%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67 / 20.9%	85 / 23.53%	74 / 40.54%
	Students With Disabilities	16 / 12.5%	21 / 4.76%	18 / 16.67%
	English Language Learners	29 / 13.79%	38 / 21.05%	29 / 24.14%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84 / 48.81%	86 / 60.47%	102 / 61.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71 / 45.07%	72 / 56.94%	82 / 58.54%
	Students With Disabilities	23 / 26.09%	22 / 27.27%	22 / 27.27%
	English Language Learners	25 / 44%	26 / 50%	27 / 59.26%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89 / 10.11%	87 / 25.29%	89 / 51.69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76 / 7.89%	73 / 19.18%	71 / 47.89%
	Students With Disabilities	27 / 3.70%	23 / 4.35%	21 / 33.33%
	English Language Learners	32 / 0%	26 / 11.54	26 / 53.85%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77 / 38.37%	86 / 38.37%	88 / 47.73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 35.48%	70 / 38.57%	70 / 45.71%
	Students With Disabilities	21 / 9.52%	22 / 9.09%	22 / 13.64%
	English Language Learners	30 / 30%	33 / 33.33%	35 / 37.14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75 / 12%	83 / 32.53%	86 / 44.19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61 / 9.84%	68 / 29.41%	69 / 39.13%
	Students With Disabilities	20 / 0%	21 / 9.52%	21 / 9.52%
	English Language Learners	29 / 13.79%	33 / 30.30%	35 / 40%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	109 / 38.26%	115 / 38.21%	119 / 39.20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94 / 37.37%	100 / 37.38%	100 / 38.10%
	Students With Disabilities	28 / 3.45%	30 / 6.06%	31 / 5.88%
	English Language Learners	37 / 23.08%	42 / 20%	42 / 25.58%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	109 / 20.18%	115 / 36.52%	122 / 43.44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94 / 19.15%	100 / 35%	102 / 39.22%
	Students With Disabilities	28 / 0%	29 / 0%	34 / 11.76%
	English Language Learners	37 / 10.81%	42 / 26.19%	42 / 33.33%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	503 / 50%	439 / 68%	233 / 62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	428 / 46%	380 / 66%	196 / 61%
	Students With Disabilities	135 / 22%	114 / 40%	60 /36%
	English Language Learners	177 / 32%	158 / 51%	85 / 43%

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	34	50	23	22	13	23				
ELL	37	38	31	32	26	23	32				
BLK	31	38		41	23		21				
HSP	42	50	29	34	32	21	36				
WHT	61	53		55	37		66				
FRL	46	45	41	39	34	22	44				

					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	40	29	31	59	50	29				
ELL	38	56	46	40	54	32	33				
BLK	32	32	23	40	56	42	26				
HSP	44	54	43	43	50	25	37				
WHT	50	52	27	53	60	50	64				
FRL	44	48	37	47	56	37	47				

					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	27	43	42	31	51	38	40				
ELL	32	33	29	33	52	36	35				
BLK	43	44	58	38	56	45	42				
HSP	39	43	35	36	53	41	43				
WHT	57	51	53	64	68	39	71				
FRL	44	47	44	46	58	40	51				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	339
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

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	34
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	31
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	37
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	
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	
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	54
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Based on FSA in grades 3-5 we were able to increase ELA proficiency by 2% but lost 6% in Math achievement.
In Science despite the data that showed 68% proficiency we lost 3% in overall achievement in grade 5.
Our 3-5 African American subgroups were able to mantain and improve in ELA and Math acheivement and ELA learning gains, however they lost significant grounds in Math learning gains and Science achievement.
Our 3-5 SWD subgroups lost grounds in all categories except our ELA LQ.

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

The greatest need for improvement shows in our Math Learning Gains which showed a decrease from 56% and 34% and Math LQ for Gen ed went from a 36% to a 19%, SWD went from 50% to a 13%, and AA students went from 42% to 0% .

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

A barrier to achievment and learning gains that we identified this school year was the use of distant learning, frequent roster changes, and excessive teacher and student absences.
The new actions that need to be taken would be to eliminate distance learning, reduce or eliminate roster changes, implement attendance incentives for students and teachers.
Implement new instructional strategies to address deficits due to attendance and distant learning.

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

Our African American students in ELA learning gains (from 32% to 38%) and lowest quartile learning gains (from 23% to 67%) and overall Math achievement (from 40% to 41%) showed the most improvement. Overall ELA lowest quartile learning gains (from 37% to 46%) also showed significant improvement.

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

The contributing factors include intentional intervention, prioritizing schedule around intervention, communicating with parents. Dissecting the data and standards analysis also contributed. Standards-based grading also contributed to the improvement.
The new actions that were taken were that we added an intervention teacher, provided tutoring during teacher planning time and after school, and added SIPPS instruction to 3rd grade. Media Specialist provided book clubs focusing on vocabulary and comprehension strategies. Support facilitation students were seen in small groups twice a day.

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

Targeted tutoring, small group instruction, and intervention groups.
Scaffolds for students with content deficits.
Review of assessment data for targeted support
Progress monitoring
Teachers review math standards in PLC before it is introduced to 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.

During Math PLC-math export provides professional development in teaching how to do the math by correctly using manipulatives and correct math vocabulary. Support facilitators, math intervention teachers and ESOL paraprofessional will be included in the PLC meetings. In these PLCs teachers make a list of misconceptions, looking at standards progression K-5.
During an ERPL-training teachers to train students to track their own data.

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

Additional services include providing students close to proficiency tutoring in ELA and Math content during and after school.
Using SAC funds to provide a stipend to teams that collaboratively team plan in all subjects.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Subgroup data indicated that African American students in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA achievement as measured on the state assessment. Spirit's African American students performed at 31%.
Measurable Outcome:	African American students in grades 3-5 will perform at or above the state threshold of 41% in ELA achievement as measured on the state assessment.
Monitoring:	During weekly PLC's African American students progress monitoring data will be reviewed by teachers, admin , and coaches to determine the course of action. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction. In addition, students will monitor their own progress after each assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Robinson (jtrobins@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The percentage of African American students that performed below proficiency will receive tier 3 researched-based intensive instruction such as the use of I-Ready lessons and lessons from Ready Reading to reduce deficits and increase proficiency on grade level standards in ELA. This will be monitored by teachers, coaches and admin during PLC discussion of data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the FSA scores this subgroup performed below the state threshold. Power Bi dashboard was used to determine the selection of the evidence-based strategy. Decision-tree criteria and I-Ready diagnostic results were also used for selecting this strategy. The Ready Reading program uses a problem solving-based approach that strengthens students' learning muscles and builds conceptual understanding through reasoning, practice, and productive discussion using real-world scenarios. Teachers get the guidance and tools they need to help them meet the needs of all learners while strengthening their instructional practice.

Action Steps to Implement

SOS, Save our Subgroup will continue to provide more intensive intervention instruction and tutoring in ELA teaching the African American students to monitor their progress, set achievement goals, and learn self-advocacy.
ERPLs will provide professional learning in ELA by our district support person and coaches. Coaches will follow up with coaching cycles to help with implementation.

Person Responsible	Danyel Hoskins (dbhoskin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC's will break down data in Power Bi and School City by each subgroup and determine course of action in the classroom, during intervention, and during ESE support group time.
ERPL's will provide professional learning in Power Bi and School City by coaches or district support person. Coaches will follow up during PLCs using collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA subgroup data indicated that students with disabilities in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA and Math achievement as measured on the state assessment. Spirit's students with disabilities performed at a 24% in both ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabiltities in grades 3-5 will perform at or above the state threshold of 41% in ELA and Math acheivement as measured on the state assessment.
Monitoring:	During PLC's students with disabilities progress monitoring data will be reviewed by teachers, admin,and coaches to determine the course of action. Students will also set goals and monitor their own progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities will receive tier 3 researched-based intensive instruction such as I-Ready lessons and Ready ELA and Math lessons to reduce deficits and increase proficiency on grade-level standards. This will be monitored by teachers, coaches and admin during PLC discussion of data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	FSA reports Identified that this subgroup performed below the state threshold. Power Bi dashboard was used to determine the selection of the evidence-based strategy. The Ready Reading and Math program uses a problem solving-based approach that strengthens students' learning muscles and builds conceptual understanding through reasoning, practice, and productive discussion using real-world scenarios. Teachers get the guidance and tools they need to help them meet the needs of all learners while strengthening their instructional practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop tier 3 intervention schedule for all students with disabilities that does not detract from core instruction.

Person Responsible	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide teacher training on utilizing accommodations and scaffolding to increase the proficiency of students on grade-level standards.

Person Responsible	Laura French (lmfrench@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor the progress of students with disabilities on formative data throughout the year by reviewing their formative assessment results and IEP goals during PLC's to help with planning standards-based instruction incorporating their accommodations. Evaluate the services and needs of students with disabilities not making progress toward grade-level proficiency every 4 weeks.

Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data on the state assessment, there was a decline in achievement, learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains in math. Teachers described a need to be given time to analyze the standards in math and collaborate on scaffolding strategies and differentiated outcomes to increase student achievement on grade-level standards. They also need to time dissect the formative assessment data and determine misconceptions.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency in grades 3-5 in Math will increase by 22 percent and will be measured by FSA data. Eighty percent of our K-2 students will perform on or above grade level overall in Math on the I-Ready diagnostic 3 assessment.
Monitoring:	Coaches, administration, ESE support facilitators, intervention teachers and ESOL teachers will be included in the collaboration during PLCs. Learning walks, visits and coaching cycles will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity is the evidence-based strategy that will be used. Teachers will collaborate among their colleagues focusing on improving a problem of practice in math by analyzing the standards and completing the math problems. It will be monitored by administrative walk-throughs and feedback will be given to the teachers during PLC.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need an in-depth understanding of the standards in Math. For this to occur they need to "do the math." Teachers also need an understanding of scaffolding strategies that enable students with deficits to participate in grade-level instruction and achieve success on grade-level standards. Teachers will ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. Teachers will use the curriculum maps and resources from Canvas.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches, intervention teachers, ESE and ESOL support leaders will plan and lead PLC's that address upcoming standards in math. Teams of teachers will be trained in PLC protocol and procedures. They will analyze the standards, develop success criteria, analyze progress monitoring formative assessments and determine scaffolding strategies needed for students with deficits.

Person Responsible	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Admin will set aside time for PLC's by planning PLC schedules weekly during the teacher's planning period.

Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaches and teachers will review formative data weekly to determine supports needed for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on grade-level standards.

Person Responsible	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data on the state assessment, there was a decline in the total possible points in ELA. Teachers described a need to be given time to analyze the standards in ELA and collaborate on scaffolding strategies and differentiated outcomes to increase student achievement on grade-level standards. They need training on the new Benchmark ELA curriculum and BEST standards. They also need to time dissect the formative assessment data and determine next steps. Based on I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment 3 in grades K-2, only 70% performed on or above grade level in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency in grades 3-5 in ELA will increase by 10 percent and will be measured by FSA data. Eighty percent of our K-2 students will perform on or above grade level overall in ELA on the I-Ready diagnostic 3 assessment.
Monitoring:	Coaches, administration, ESE support facilitators, intervention teachers and ESOL teachers will be included in the collaboration during PLCs. Learning walks, visits and coaching cycles will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity is the evidence-based strategy that will be used. Teachers will collaborate among their colleagues focusing on improving their practice in ELA by analyzing the standards and developing scaffolded questions for whole group and small group. It will be monitored by administrative walk-throughs and feedback will be given to the teachers during PLC.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need an in-depth understanding of the BEST and LAFS standards in ELA. They need to attend trainings on the Benchmark ELA curriculum and BEST standards. Teachers also need an understanding of scaffolding strategies that enable students with deficits to participate in grade-level instruction and achieve success on grade-level standards. Teachers will ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. Teachers will use the curriculum maps and resources from Canvas.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches, intervention teachers, ESE and ESOL support leaders will use PLC time to dissect ELA standards to create learning targets and success criteria. Teams of teachers will be trained in PLC protocol and procedures. They will also analyze progress monitoring formative assessments and determine scaffolding strategies needed for students with deficits.

Person Responsible	DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Admin will set aside time for PLC's by planning PLC schedules weekly during the teacher's planning period.

Person Responsible	Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaches and teachers will review formative data weekly to determine supports needed for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on grade-level standards.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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.

SPIRIT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-7871 reported 2.6 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.
The primary area of concern based on the data is violent incidents where we rank #1225/1395 in the state and 34/45 in the county.
Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will provide CHAMPS training to new teachers.
Teachers will review CHAMPS procedures for each activity in the classroom and each common area on campus.
School will post de-escalation strategy posters in each area of campus and classroom, reinforcing, ignore, raise hand for help, and walk away strategies to deal with conflict.

Teachers will refer students with continued conflicts to the school counselor for mediation.
Students who display aggressive, disruptive or dangerous behavior will be referred to the League of Mentors program on campus to be matched up with a mentor who can spend 30 min a week with the student.
All teachers will train students on the role of law enforcement on campus.
Student displaying behavior consistent with a disability will have interventions put into place and their response tracked, including the use of a behavior specialist when a disability is suspected.
Teachers will be provided time in their schedule to provide SEL lessons focusing on teaching students the strategies to de-escalate.

We will monitor these actions by doing walk-throughs and providing coaching cycles where necessary.

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.

Spirit Elementary uses Class Dojo, Twitter, Facebook and our school website to solicit feedback from stakeholders, share school vision and mission. In addition we share pictures of school, students, achievements and successes on our platforms.
Students are recognized using positive referrals on the morning news. Teachers fill out positive referrals for

students who demonstrate our core values: being safe, being their best, being responsible, and being respectful and kind, or showing great improvement in _____. The teachers add comments that are read aloud on the news. The admin team takes pictures with the students who are recognized and they receive a key chain with "you are the difference" embroidered on the back. The student gets a "flag" for their key chain each time they are recognized with a positive referral.

Spirit Elementary will hold curriculum events to assist parents in understanding student standards, performance expectations and how they can support their learners at home.

The school counselor (vacant) will hold tier 2 groups for students who are on tier 2 behavior plans or who struggle with coping or advocacy. Students who do not respond to the small group intervention are recommended to outside agencies such as Childrens Home Society for tier 3 or 1:1 support.

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

Jamie Robinson and Carrie Devaney- Reading Spirit Believes in You awards on the morning news and deliver awards to students receiving awards in the classroom, take a picture and post on our social media accounts.

Michelle Gaetjens-Post pictures on social media
(Vacant) School Counselor-Post conflict resolution and self-advocacy posters in classrooms and common areas. Provide conflict resolution opportunities for students.

Teachers-Provide calm down corner in classrooms and prompt students to de-escalate when needed. Refer students to school counselor when needed. Use ClassDojo to reward students for following school-wide expectations: Be safe, Be Kind, Be respectful, Be responsible.