Edith I. Starke Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edith I. Starke Elementary School

730 S PARSONS AVE, Deland, FL 32720

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

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Aivazis A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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.](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

Edith I. Starke Elementary School

730 S PARSONS AVE, Deland, FL 32720

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/starke/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	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

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.

At Edith I. Starke Elementary our mission is to provide a safe and positive culture to ensure ALL students are learning at high levels, so they are college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Edith I. Starke will be recognized as an Outstanding Elementary School in Volusia County that sends its learners to the next level prepared at the highest level. Edith I. Starke will be recognized Nationally as a Professional Learning Community 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
Ahr, Eileen	Principal	To be the instructional leader at the school.
Cervantes, Amy	Instructional Coach	To support teacher instruction in ELA.
Ruppen, Jessica	Math Coach	To support teacher instruction in Math.
Williams, Willie	Assistant Principal	To support teachers with curriculum materials, providing frequent observation and feedback. To support teachers with student discipline
Snipes, Buffy	Administrative Support	Support teachers with curriculum and discipline.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/23/2021, Jessica Aivazis A

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
32

Total number of students enrolled at the school
299

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	44	50	52	40	40	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Attendance below 90 percent	7	26	22	21	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	3	13	24	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	2	3	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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
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	16	76	55	54	68	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332
Attendance below 90 percent	6	22	13	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	0	3	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	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	16	76	55	54	68	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332
Attendance below 90 percent	6	22	13	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	0	3	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	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				44%	56%	57%	43%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	42%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	53%	42%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	59%	63%	60%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	56%	62%	63%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	43%	51%	45%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	57%	53%	57%	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	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic three times a year.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50/10%	58/27.59%	55/43.64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/10.20%	57/26.32%	54/42.59%
	Students With Disabilities	5/0%	5/0%	5/20%
	English Language Learners	11/0%	15/13.33%	12/33.33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/2.04	54/16.67	53/45.28
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/2.08	53/16.98	52/44.23
	Students With Disabilities	4/0	6/0	6/16.67
	English Language Learners	11/0	11/9.09	12/27.61

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37/24.32	38/34.21	36/61.11
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/24.32	38/34.21	35/62.86
	Students With Disabilities	4/25	4/25	3/0
	English Language Learners	12/25	12/50	12/75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/14.29	35/31.43	37/35.14
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/14.29	35/31.43	36/36.11
	Students With Disabilities	4/25	4/0	4/0
	English Language Learners	12/16.66	12/75	13/61.54

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/39.02	46/39.13	47/44.68
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/39.02	44/40.91	45/46.67
	Students With Disabilities	8/12.50	10/10	9/22.22
	English Language Learners	11/27.27	14/28.57	15/33.33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38/10.53	46/17.39	45/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	38/10.53	44/18.18	43/41.86
	Students With Disabilities	7/0	10/10	9/33.33
	English Language Learners	10/10	14/7.14	14/35.71

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/13.11	62/16.13	70/12.87
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/13.33	61/16.39	69/13.04
	Students With Disabilities	16/6.25	15/6.67	18/5.56
	English Language Learners	19/5.26	20/15	20/5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/3.28	61/21.31	63/44.44
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/3.33	60/20	62/43.55
	Students With Disabilities	16/0	15/13.33	16/18.75
	English Language Learners	19/5.26	19/31.58	20/40

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/16.67	53/30.51	53/30.65
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/16.67	53/30.51	53/30.65
	Students With Disabilities	16/6.25	16/0	16/0
	English Language Learners	12/0	12/14.29	12/8.33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/11.54	53/18.87	55/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/11.54	53/18.87	55/40
	Students With Disabilities	14/0	16/0	15/6.67
	English Language Learners	10/0	12/0	11/27.27
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	208/47	187/61	106/79
	Economically Disadvantaged	208/47	187/61	106/79
	Students With Disabilities	61/31	52/31	30/64
	English Language Learners	48/11	42/33	20/64

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	22	18		31	44		12				
ELL	26	50		38	60						
BLK	36	54		46	61		35				
HSP	34	55		46	64		67				
WHT	27	36		45	64		30				
FRL	35	53	55	46	61	50	43				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	28	37	29	37	50	41	33				
ELL	45	48	47	52	44	38	46				
BLK	41	51	43	49	46	31	55				
HSP	46	36	33	46	43	36	46				
WHT	42	75		68	68						
FRL	43	49	48	53	49	36	53				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	33	41	31	40	53	50	55				
ELL	32	32	30	51	52	40					
BLK	40	45	44	55	62	38	54				
HSP	46	38	43	60	60	50	65				
WHT	52	48		74	71						
FRL	42	41	42	59	63	45	54				

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	47
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	44
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	46
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	52
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	
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	42
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	49
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?

Our overall population does not demonstrate significant proficiency levels in ELA 35% or Math 46%. However, 5th grade showed substantial learning gains at 60%, including those within the lowest quartile at 45%. Our SWD were our lowest performing subgroup, with all subcategories in ELA falling within the F range. SWD make up 25% of our student population, having a great impact on our overall performance levels.

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

ELA is the greatest need of improvement as our overall achievement was at 35%.

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

Fourth grade has faced instability since first grade due to shifts in classes and changes to teachers. Other factors include poor attendance, students and teachers being quarantined, and a shift from five days of Reading Intervention per week to four. To improve, we need to make shifts in ELA small group, place emphasis on ELA power standards during Walk to Extension, and teaching test taking strategies.

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

We showed the greatest improvement in math learning gains 48% to 60% and lowest quartile 36% to 45%. In addition, our ELA learning gains improved 50% 52% ELA lowest quartile 48% to 50%.

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

Specific to math, we implemented a focus on power standards during the math Walk to Extension block. Our PLC were very intentional and focused on the four essential questions, with spiraling instruction and test spec alignment. We took an all hands on deck approach during the math Walk to Intervention block to provide hands on small group support .

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

To accelerate learning, teachers will use pre and post assessments as well as ongoing progress monitoring to drive instruction. In addition, teachers will assign iReady lessons to reinforce targeted skills.

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.

To support teachers learning and implementation of these initiatives, we will provide further training on how to be a highly-effective PLC, increasing teacher clarity, and diving deep into learning targets.

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

Professional development opportunities will include ongoing coaching support, modeling, and accountability measures.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1, engage all student in high levels of learning every day. Per our needs assessment, our SWD ELA Achievement was 22%, Learning gains were 18%, and Lowest Quartile 29%. Our African American subgroup's score was 36%, falling below the district average.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ELA Achievement goal is to increase from 22% to 41%, increase from 18% to 41% in ELA learning gains, as well a increase from 29% to 41% in the ELA Lowest Quartile subgroup. In addition, our African American subgroup will increase from 36% to 41%.
Monitoring:	During PLC discussions, we will conduct data chats to drive instructional decision making at the student level as well as identify professional learning and coaching needs. These needs will be the focus of learning cycles and will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using the ELA "Look-Fors" walkthrough tool and weekly walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum. Small Group Instruction 47% effect size. We will monitor this strategy through Collaborative Team Planning, PLCs and frequent walk throughs by school-based administration and coaches.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using Benchmark and Ready Reading during our small group instruction. Small group instruction has a high effect size of .47 per John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

Through the use of collaborative planning and data analysis, we will identify ELA Power Standards in each grade level. Professional development will consist of unpacking the standards and identifying highly-effective UDL strategies. Further support will include coaching cycles and constructive feedback. - Learning outcomes will be monitored monthly to guide instructional decisions.

Person Responsible	Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor Tier 3 student monthly using progress checks with iReady.

Person Responsible	Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Shifting the work load to the students by reducing over scaffolding and reaching the level of rigor of the standard.

Person Responsible	Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1, engage all student in high levels of learning every day. This area was identified as a need based on our overall achievement of 35%, which dropped from 44% in 2019. It is our lowest performing area, and most critical need.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ELA Achievement will increase to 41% from a 35%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool identifying specific ELA look-fors. In addition, we will conduct data chats during PLC discussions to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Coaching cycles will be based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Cervantes (alcervan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction using grade level text, being strategic with scaffolding. Using guaranteed curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using Benchmark and Ready Reading during our small group instruction. Small group instruction has a high effect size of .47 per John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify ELA Power Standards in all grade levels
Implementing Power Standards in the Extension Block (foundational or comprehension)
Conduct Walk throughs during core and small group instruction
Continue training on new material
Monitor using Mastery Test
Monitor using District Assessments
Through the use of collaborative planning and data analysis, we will identify ELA Power Standards in each grade level. Professional development will consist of unpacking the standards and identifying highly-effective UDL strategies. Further support will include coaching cycles and constructive feedback. - Learning outcomes will be monitored monthly to guide instructional decisions.

Person Responsible	Amy Cervantes (alcervan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area to focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all student in high levels of learning Every day. Our science data dropped from 54% to 43% and our ESSA Group dropped from a 55% to a 12% which is below the district average
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase our Science Achievement from 43% to a 62%. Our ESSA group Students with Disabilities will increase from a 12% to 41%. Our African American subgroup will increase to a 41% from a 35%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor through Topic Checks, SMT in some grades. We will also conduct walk throughs during science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Ruppen (jlruppe1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using Hands on Minds on science- Note Taking Increase Vocabulary Interactive notebooks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cooperative learning consisting of hands on minds on instruction has an effect size of .55 per John Hattie. Other highly effective strategies being implemented include note taking which has an effect size of .50; while vocabulary building's effect size is .62.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and students will engage with Academic Vocabulary
Science based texts will be embedded within the ELA Extension block
All grade levels will conduct Common Experiments
All grade levels will participate in a School-wide Science Fair
The academic coach and teachers will work in collaboration with the district science department to develop a strategic plan for increasing opportunities to interact with academic vocabulary as well as increase hands on minds on learning. This includes the establishment of a school-wide science fair and use of common experiments to target specific content areas while developing knowledge specific to the nature of science.

Person Responsible	Jessica Ruppen (jlruppe1@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.

SafeSchoolforAlex.org reports an incident rate of 0.7 out of 100 students. This ranks Starke at 14/ 45 elementary schools. We also have an incident ranking of high as the result of reported weapons possession and campus disruptions. This is greatly influenced by our surrounding community and is being addressed by our Safety and Security Committee, Threat Assessment Team, and mentoring program. When reviewing referral data, we learned the majority of offenses occur in the classroom, with only 5 students receiving two or more referrals. In response, mentors were assigned and behavioral contract were developed for these students.

While our out of school suspensions dropped from 62 in 2018 to 11 in 2019 last year, when conducting an end of the year survey regarding behavioral concerns, teachers expressed a need to strengthen our school-wide behavioral approach, emphasizing a need for universal expectations and consequences. In response, our pre-planning professional learning consisted of PBIS structures, how to utilize the behavior tracking tools, and establishing school-wide expectation in common areas. To ensure consistency across campus, we also worked collaboratively to create a spread sheet listing common offenses and aligned consequences. Our Leadership team will meet monthly to monitor discipline data, identify students of concern, and develop a plan for intervention.

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.

At Edith I Starke we work diligently to build a positive school culture and environment. This year we are implementing AVID and we revisited our PBIS structures. We have changed the face of our buildings where we have college flags hanging in the café and around bulletin boards and in classrooms. We have a clear mission and vision along with teacher commitments that support creating a positive school culture.
This year as I stated we revisited our PBIS structures and strengthened our Guiding Principles by attaching the expectations to each guiding principle. We also created a schoolwide Behavior Guideline spread sheet that aligns to our guiding principles with example infractions, exemplar behaviors, consequences - infractions and consequences-exemplars.
Teachers have the first 15 minutes of the day for SEL instruction
Finally, we use our Koala Dollars to support positive behavior.

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

Leadership Team- Mission and Vision
Classroom Teachers- SEL instruction in the classroom, use of the Behavior Guidelines spreadsheet
Faculty- Use of the Koala Dollars to support positive behavior
School Counselor- supporting specific students with small group and classes on a rotational basis.

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: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00