

Volusia County Schools

Friendship 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

Friendship Elementary School

2746 FULFORD ST, Deltona, FL 32738

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

Demographics

Principal: William Rednour A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2021

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 (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Friendship Elementary School

2746 FULFORD ST, Deltona, FL 32738

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/friendship/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	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

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.

Friendship Elementary will empower ALL students to succeed by providing high quality, equitable, and positive educational experiences that build academic success and a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through inclusive collaborative practices, Friendship Elementary will create a safe, positive, supportive learning environment where each student is valued and empowered to reach their fullest potential.

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
Velez, Eidie	Principal	Principal: Lead or Head Coach for improvement of the school and instruction. Sets the mission for the school and is responsible for monitoring and continued progress and growth of students and teachers. Ensures provided budget supports the needs of the students and instructional and professional needs of the teachers. Ensures the school culture is positive and the learning environment is conducive to learning for all students.
Beeghly, Elaine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal is in support of the mission and vision and serves in the capacity or manager of operations overseeing facilities and student behaviors. The assistant principal works with the principal as part of the school leadership team in an effort to help develop teachers, schedules, and ensures teacher best practices are in place to move the school forward.
Campbell, Dylan	Instructional Coach	Math Coach supports and develops teacher best practices through implementation of the coaching model. The IC models instructional best practices and supports teachers towards developing their own plan for professional improvement. The IC also works closely with the Principal as a member of the SLT to provide professional development and to focus all practices toward improving the overall instructional to meet established academic achievement.
Yonker, Michael	Teacher, K-12	The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targets instruction, utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student ongoing progress monitoring and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content.
Rodriguez, Nancy	Other	ELL Teacher- The ELL teacher is responsible for providing targeted instruction, intervention, supports, and accommodations to students identified as ELL. The ELL teacher also makes recommendations, provides instructional supports, and monitors ELL student progress.
McCoy, Becky	Other	Reading Intervention Teacher: The reading intervention teacher works closely with students and monitors classroom, state and district data to develop a plan for improvement for students who struggle in reading. The reading intervention teacher provides targets interventions to fill the existing gaps in the learning of struggling students.
Piehl, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targets instruction, utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		ongoing progress monitoring and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content.
Mullins, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targets instruction, utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student ongoing progress monitoring and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/5/2021, William Rednour 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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

380

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

4

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	62	63	54	74	54	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	15	23	15	29	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	26	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	2	8	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	4	0	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

Thursday 8/5/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	73	70	73	75	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	9	12	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	73	70	73	75	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	9	12	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				48%	56%	57%	49%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	58%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	46%	53%	46%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	59%	63%	55%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	56%	62%	40%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	43%	51%	33%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	57%	53%	44%	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	44%	58%	-14%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	59%	3%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Math iReady diagnostic assessment

SMT

VLT

Topic checks

ELA iReady

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46/22%	56/23%	50/48
	Economically Disadvantaged	38/24%	44/23%	41/49%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8%	15/0%	12/8%
	English Language Learners	9/0%	12/17%	8/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42/10%	50/16%	50/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/11%	40/15%	41/41%
	Students With Disabilities	8/13%	12/0%	12/25%
	English Language Learners	7/0%	8/13%	8/31%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61/21%	64/30%	69/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/22%	62/31%	64/47%
	Students With Disabilities	8/38%	9/23%	9/33%
	English Language Learners	13/15%	13/15%	12/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57/16%	65/15%	67/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/16%	63/16%	63/38%
	Students With Disabilities	7/14%	8/13%	9/11%
	English Language Learners	12/0%	13/15%	12/25%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/41%	57/35%	63/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/40%	52/37%	55/51%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18%	14/7%	14/14%
	English Language Learners	9/11%	12/8%	11/27%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50/12%	56/18%	61/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/8%	51/18%	54/35%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8%	13/8%	14/14%
	English Language Learners	10/0%	11/9%	11/18%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/20%	67/33%	74/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/21%	59/32%	63/38%
	Students With Disabilities	15/0%	18/0%	18/0%
	English Language Learners	15/20%	19/26%	23/22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51/6%	73/37%	70/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/4%	63/40%	59/54%
	Students With Disabilities	13/8%	21/5%	18/22%
	English Language Learners	15/7%	22/36%	21/62%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/22%	69/33%	72/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57/22%	58/31%	59/36%
	Students With Disabilities	20/10%	19/11%	20/9%
	English Language Learners	15/31%	15/20%	16/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66/11%	74/20%	71/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57/12%	62/19%	58/47%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0%	19/11%	20/25%
	English Language Learners	15/0%	17/6%	15/47%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	309/27%	270/50%	211/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	264/29%	224/49%	175/54%
	Students With Disabilities	92/17%	74/26%	55/32%
	English Language Learners	70/14%	61/31%	46/47%

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	13	17	20	13	16	9	11				
ELL	41	46		32	31		43				
BLK	38	60		29	30		50				
HSP	38	44		29	33		54				
WHT	41	35		40	24		40				
FRL	41	42	29	32	26	7	45				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	56	67	24	33	25					
ELL	28	45		38	35						
BLK	45	56		32	21		25				
HSP	47	59	67	57	56	42	53				

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
WHT	51	54		58	55		67				
FRL	47	56	70	49	41	30	46				
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	12	32	42	4	16	18					
ELL	43	44		44	41						
BLK	33	44		33	25		42				
HSP	50	54	73	60	50	40	35				
WHT	60	41		64	41		56				
FRL	46	40	38	52	37	20	45				

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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	269
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	41
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	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
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?

Our trends show that our Lowest Quartile for Math and ELA, Math Learning Gains, SWDs in all areas, and attendance decreased.

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

The areas of Math, ELA, and ESSA subgroups in particular our SWDs demonstrate the greatest need.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement were: COVID-19 Pandemic, Attendance, Inconsistency of instructional modalities, and emotional factors. Actions needed to address this improvement are:

Develop school wide consistent instructional expectations and practices via teacher clarity and coaching model

Provide teacher/student emotional supports,

Peer Walk throughs and feedback opportunities

Focused PLC data chats for intervention and progress monitoring

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

5th grade Science and the African American Subgroup for the areas of ELA Gains and Lowest Quartile made most improvements.

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

School Wide Culture and Diversity Professional Development

Focused discussions of subgroups in PLCs.

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

Implement Teacher/Student Clarity practices

Differentiated Instructional approaches

Increase student engagement practices

AVID

Clear school wide expectations

Focused PLCs/data chats/Modeling/Trainings

Build positive peer student relationships

Increase parental supports

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.

Teacher Clarity Training

AVID Training

Collaborative practices for increasing-Data Analysis via PLCs

Math differentiated instruction/BEST standards

BEST Standards-focused instructional strategies in all academic areas

Classroom Management

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

Academic Coaching support/Modeling/PLCs

District Academic Supports in PLCs and or ERPLs

AVID Implementation

After school tutoring opportunities

Mentoring opportunities

School Wide Positive House System

School Clubs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage students in high levels of math learning every day. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it was revealed that our math proficiency was at 32%. Math learning gains were 27% and the lowest quartile performed at 7% which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that students in our ESSA Subgroups: SWDs and AA performed below 41% in the area of Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall math proficiency from 32% to 55%. Increase math learning gains from 27% to 50%. Increase lowest quartile learning gains from 7% to 50%.; including ESSA subgroups, SWD, AA, and ELL
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthroughs tool with specific mathematic look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is teacher clarity to increase math skills of all students in all domains. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining the next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity which has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). Teacher clarity promotes high expectations and encourages students to take ownership of their success when implemented with fidelity. Refine systematic practices and increase knowledge through coaching model, sharing, and professional learning for implementation of BEST standards to increase math skills for students in all areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Communicate with faculty the steps and goals of our SIP including AVID strategies implement. WICOR Writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, reading. Ongoing training in PLC, ER, District training and support with implementation. Student notebooks, notetaking, organizational tools implemented.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Continue teacher clarity training and modeling through PLCS and ERPLs.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Time for data analysis during PLCs.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Conducting focused PLCs on identifying learning targets, reviewing student work, and identifying student needs.

Person Responsible Elaine Beeghly (eabeeghl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Planning within grade levels.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of walkthrough tool and monitoring feedback.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage students in high levels of ELA learning every day. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 39%. ELA learning gains were 44% and the lowest quartile performed at 33% which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed students in our ESSA Subgroup in particular SWD subgroup all performed below 41% in the area of ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency from 39% to 55% Increase ELA learning gains from 44% to 60%. Increase lowest quartile learning gains from 33% to 65%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthroughs tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Administration and Academic Coaches.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is teacher clarity and AVID strategies to increase ELA skills of all students in all domains. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining the next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). Teacher clarity promotes high expectations and encourages students to take ownership of their success. AVID strategies encourage higher-level thinking questions and organizational skills needed to succeed.
Action Steps to Implement	
Communicate with faculty the steps and goals of our SIP with the focus of Avid Strategies incorporated to support. Writing Inquiry collaboration organization reading - WICOR district training, PLC, student binders school wide.	
Person Responsible	Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)
On-going teacher clarity training, Best standards, and modeling of best practices through PLCS and ERPLs.	
Person Responsible	Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Collaborative Planning, data analysis within grade level PLCs for alignment to standards.	
Person Responsible	Elaine Beeghly (eabeeghl@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Implementation of walkthrough tool and monitoring feedback.	
Person Responsible	Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Based on the ESSA data reviewed our SWD subgroups performed below in all areas which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that our African American subgroup decreased in math achievement and math lowest quartile, which was below our district and state average all below 41% in all areas related to math.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA, Math, Science from below 41% to 50%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through data analysis through PLCs and intervention data, data chats to determine specific student needs and next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence-based strategy is teacher clarity, AVID strategies, and walkthroughs to increase the academic skills of all students in all domains. We will monitor this through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining the next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). Teacher clarity promotes high expectations and encourages students to take ownership of their success. AVID strategies encourage higher-level thinking questions and organizational skills needed to succeed.

Action Steps to Implement

Communicate with faculty the steps and goals of our SIP.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conducting focused PLCs on identifying learning targets, reviewing student work, and identifying student needs.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of walkthrough tool and monitoring feedback.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Time for data analysis during PLCs.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Collaborative Planning within grade levels.

Person Responsible Elaine Beeghly (eabeeghl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue teacher clarity training and modeling through PLCS and ERPLs.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional development on equity and diversity.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified fighting, physical attack, and threats and intimidation. It was ranked very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will:

Professional Development on classroom management
Identify mentors for students
Provide incident data to teachers quarterly.

Teachers will:

Develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to resolve conflicts
Implement and monitor school wide positive school culture House system points
Implementing positive behavior interventions to support identified students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school promotes a positive school culture through the implementation of a school wide House system. The school has a "Culture Community Committee" AKA "Triple C" which meet monthly to discuss, monitor, and implement school wide student incentives, activities, school improvement projects, and rewards for building a positive school culture and environment.

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

The School Administration-Principal and Assistant Principal-promote a positive school culture daily through morning and afternoon announcements, visibility on campus, communicating with students, staff, and stakeholders, and providing the resources

Triple C Committee-Lead Person-Rebecca McCoy, schedules and meets with committee monthly to discuss school culture, House Points and incentives, and develops plan for school improvement projects and activities.

All Instructional staff, through implementation and monitoring of daily House points for student success.

School Counselor- oversees mentoring and provides SEL instruction and small group counseling to promote positive school culture.

Coaches monitor student data and will provide updated data in PLCs to identify students who will require intensive supports and mentoring for success.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00