Deltona Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona Elementary School

2055 DELTONA BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34606

https://www.hernandoschools.org/des

Demographics

Principal: Debi Shellabarger

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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 Hernando 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

Deltona Elementary School

2055 DELTONA BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34606

https://www.hernandoschools.org/des

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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 Hernando 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.

In Partnership with parents and the community Deltona Elementary School is:
Determined to provide
Outstanding educational
Values to
Empower
Students

Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Determination, Empowerment

Provide the school's vision statement.

ALL children WILL achieve at high levels.

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
Shellabarger, Debi	Principal	Oversees the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Sweeney, Julie	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with overseeing the SIP with fidelity.
Hill, Kenneth	Teacher, ESE	ESE Resource and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for overseeing the ESE department. The collection of data, the writing and monitoring of IEP's for Students with Disabilities subgroup. Assisting in 5th grade classrooms as needed based on assessment data.
Casto, Cynthia	Administrative Support	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1 AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.
Steele, Michelle	Administrative Support	Achievement Gap Liaison and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level equity data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for overseeing, running, and monitoring equity groups.
Roush, Cindy	Administrative Support	MTSS coordinator and a member of the School Based Leadership team responsible for obtaining and reporting MTSS data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional path based on state and county (AP1, AP2, AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Arledge, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team Leader teacher responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly Team Leader meetings.
Makohon-Lynch, Sophia	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team Leader teacher responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly Team Leader meetings.
Falkinburg, Marcia	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team Leader teacher responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly Team Leader meetings.
Welch, Diane	Instructional Coach	County Reading Coach responsible for providing staff support as needed.
Dibble, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team leader teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Donaghy, Garrett	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team Leader teacher responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly Team Leader meetings.
Gendron, Amy	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor and member of the School Based leadership team responsible for PBIS support, attendance monitoring, social skills groups, and provides counseling for the overall well being of all students. Also part of the Threat Assessment Team.
Iannaccone, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team leader teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Gracy, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Team leader teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Schlechter, Magen	Other	Title I Coordinator assists with the monitoring of programs that were tied to area of need based on data. The coordination of family and engagement activities and ensures that Federal Compliance and monitoring is being met.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/28/2021, Debi Shellabarger

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/19/2021

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	141	144	132	136	115	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791
Attendance below 90 percent	87	81	62	75	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
One or more suspensions	6	19	17	25	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	4	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	8	24	24	27	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	141	144	132	136	115	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791
Attendance below 90 percent	87	81	62	75	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
One or more suspensions	6	19	17	25	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	4	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	8	24	24	27	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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				52%	54%	57%	52%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	53%	58%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	53%	45%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	58%	63%	48%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	57%	62%	28%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	48%	51%	22%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	54%	53%	45%	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	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	52%	-12%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	55%	-13%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	34	43	58	44	55	64	50				
ELL	46			46							
BLK	38	40		23	50						
HSP	47	63		45	44		46				
MUL	44			40							
WHT	55	55	64	51	45	36	57				
FRL	49	51	60	42	44	50	43				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	21	28	20	26	28	9				
ELL	29	36		41	45						
BLK	32	57		36	43						

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
HSP	46	41	15	56	56	60	33				
MUL	75	62		63	54						
WHT	54	46	41	56	45	31	41				
FRL	52	47	45	54	52	44	43				

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	20	32	44	24	30	28	13				
ELL	56	67		38	27						
BLK	31	40		35	8						
HSP	58	53	53	47	26	27	33				
MUL	53			59							
WHT	53	49	41	48	29	24	46				
FRL	51	51	48	45	27	17	43				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	38
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	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	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	52
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	50
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over 21% of our staff members feel they do not have leadership opportunities, which was one of the lowest scoring areas on the staff survey.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the percentage of teachers who were not provided leadership opportunities to 15% as measured by the staff survey for the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	SBLT and Team Leaders involving their team members to assist in taking on leadership roles and responsibilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership opportunities will be placed on schoolwide e-mail to promote more staff member participation. Leadership opportunities for clubs will be presented at SBLT/Team Leader Meetings. Increase opportunities for staff members to run PLC trainings based on their strengths and skills and walkthrough data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By promoting clubs and other leadership opportunities schoolwide, it gives the opportunity for all staff members to take on leadership roles.

Action Steps to Implement

Bi-monthly SBLT and Team Leader meetings with discussion of their team members and what leadership opportunities they have created.

Person Responsible Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Based on walkthrough, diagnostic, and SWAP data, administration will provide opportunites for staff members to provide specific trainings during PLC's.

Person Responsible Julie Sweeney (sweeney_j1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA FSA showed a decrease in the following areas: 3rd: 9% increase in Level 1s and 5% decrease in proficiency (57 to 52), 4th grade decreased from 58% to 40%. Common planning protocols will be reinstated to support teachers in delivering standards-aligned instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	3rd grade: DES will decrease the number of Level 1's from 23% to 13%. DES will increase proficiency from 52 to 60%. 4th grade: DES will increase proficiency from 40% to 50% 5th grade: DES will increase proficiency from 56% to 60%. All measurements will be based on the 2022 Statewide Standardized FSA ELA assessment.
Monitoring:	Administrative walkthroughs will focus on Domain 1E: Designing Coherent Instruction .70 i-Ready usage/pass rates will be reviewed weekly. 1.29 i-Ready diagnostic review will be reviewed for % of students making typical and stretch growth. .68
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitated planning will be the strategy to increase standards-aligned instruction with a focus on analyzing formative data to drive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitated planning will allow teachers to collaborate to analyze diagnostic data, learn supporting benchmark and clarifications (ELA), identify I can statement, develop student tasks, and common formatives.
Action Steps to Implement	

Common Planning times will be established by each grade level and funds will be allocated for additional duty.

Person Responsible	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administrators will attend planning sessions using resources from facilitated planning binder.

Person Responsible	Julie Sweeney (sweeney_j1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

PD on Danielson Framework (1E) and administrative walkthrough tool will be delivered.

Person Responsible	Julie Sweeney (sweeney_j1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administrators will do walkthroughs to access the effectiveness of planning and lesson delivery.

Person Responsible	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Bi-weekly data chats will focus on formative and progress monitoring data with the purpose of differentiating instruction to meet the needs of students.

Person Responsible	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student daily attendance decreased from 92% in 2019-2020, to an average of 73% due to the Covid-19 pandemic and students working digitially.
Measurable Outcome:	DES will increase daily student attendance from 73% to 85%.
Monitoring:	Parent communication logs will be kept by each teacher indicating phone calls home when students are absent for one or more days. Daily attendance reports from the data entry clerk. Social worker will monitor attendance data and do home visits as well as maintain a communication log for students who miss 5 or more days of school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Relationship building using Sanford Harmony and mentors throughout the school to increase a positive culture, which in turn will increase student attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Building relationships with students makes them feel a part of the school and builds the culture of community between staff and students which makes students want to come to school, therefore increasing attendance.

Action Steps to Implement	
PLC to train staff in Sanford Harmony.	
Person Responsible	Julie Sweeney (sweeney_j1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Utilizing Michelle Barnes, district coach, we will recruit mentor teachers and select students for mentor program.	
Person Responsible	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the Federal Index, the SWD subgroup scored 21% which is below the state requirement of 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD federal index will increase from 21% to 41%.
Monitoring:	Improve fidelity in core curriculum areas and increase overall student engagement. Facilitated lesson planning and focus on effective reading strategies. Proactive team meetings focusing on growth of SWD students bi-monthly, IEP goals will be specifically based on i-Ready data. I-Ready tools for instruction lessons will be implemented. Students will work in small groups with teachers and/or paraprofessionals to strengthen skills in both reading and math. Intervention logs will be maintained and progress monitoring will be completed via i-Ready growth monitoring reports. The SBLT team will review achievement gap data and specific students that fall within the SWD subgroup and problem solve results monthly. In addition the equity team will meet bi-monthly to discuss the SWD subgroup and specific students growth and progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	I-Ready data, both diagnostic and growth monitoring, RTI-b Data and MTSS. An achievement gap liaison will assist in monitoring our SWD subgroup students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to our SWD underperforming in reading and math, therefore decreasing our overall Federal Index score.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Based on the Safe Schools data, suspension data has shown a downward trend, we will continue to promote a positive school culture using PBIS, Sanford Harmony, and the Universal Screener.

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.

All staff members are provided positive post cards to utilize in specific recognition of students. Post cards must be sent to one student per week and turned into administration, Thursday's by 3:45, prior to being sent home.

All staff members are provided with Caught Being Good cards which students can earn for acts of kindness, acts of civility, campus beautification, academic achievements, etc.. The Caught Being Good cards are collected monthly and a drawing is conducted for prizes either purchased through PBS funds or donated by local community members/businesses.

Students earn PBIS Dove Dollars that is credited to them via a credit card daily. Specific Dove Dollars are earned based on intermediate and primary grade level expectations. Students can purchase items using their Dove Dollars at the Dovemart Incentive Store weekly.

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

Positive post cards when received by students encourages them to take ownership of their learning and promotes a positive environment enticing them to improve their attendance for possible future recognition.

Caught being good cards promote positive behavior and academic achievement encouraging students to behave according to the student code of conduct and to achieve higher learning goals in order to earn the potential prizes.

Each teacher is responsible for allocating Dove Dollars to their student's credit card daily. By rewarding students for meeting their daily expectations discipline data will decrease, attendance will increase, and student achievement will increase.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00