Manatee Cove Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Douglas D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	53%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tuten, Susan	Principal	
Cook-Grant, Tiffanee	Assistant Principal	
Crane, Katherine	SAC Member	
Benson-Culver, Michele	Teacher, K-12	
Robertson, Jeffrey	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Alicia Douglas D

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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
60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

755

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

28

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	103	144	109	176	96	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	7	57	31	55	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	11	7	20	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	14	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	7	4	8	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	11	5	34	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	4	30	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	2	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	2	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	53%	56%				61%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						53%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						37%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	42%	50%				66%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						55%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						36%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	55%	59%				64%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	59%	16%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	28	25	23	30	43	39	40				
ELL	41	50	23	35	68	65	42				
BLK	25	65	60	33	60	50	21				
HSP	42	47	33	39	60	59	42				
MUL	40										
WHT	60	51	33	60	70	56	65				
FRL	44	49	38	44	63	55	41				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	29		35	43	45	8				
ELL	39	38		33	31		31				
BLK	54	45		42	36		42				
HSP	47	55	10	36	45	45	41				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	63	57	36	61	64		68				
FRL	53	49	26	47	49	45	51				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	28	24	30	36	26	26				
ELL	33	62	69	36	35	18	57				
BLK	53	39		70	52		40				
HSP	51	60	50	54	44	14	59				
MUL	68	58		80	75						
WHT	64	51	32	67	56	45	70				
FRL	54	48	36	58	49	32	56				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Level 3 or higher has trended downward in ELA, Math, and Science. Learning gains for the same time trended down in ELA, but increased in Math. Lowest Quartile data indicates an upward trend in Math as well.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA 3rd Grade Achievement Level, ELA learning gains and Lowest Quartile learning gains

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

Numerous teachers and substitutes rotated classroom coverage as the teacher due to vacancies. Academic coaches in classrooms as teachers as well. Hire high quality teachers for the 2022 - 2023 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELL students achievement, learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains in math showed the greatest improvement.

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

ESOL teachers and paraprofessional scheduling and use of IXL Math to address learning gaps.

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

The use of interventions in a timely manner for all Tiers of MTSS, with a focus on our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The school's Academic Coach and District curriculum Resource Teachers will be utilized to assist teachers with implementing Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction/intervention. Teachers participation and use of instructional strategies learning as part of our collaborative book study using Total Participation Techniques, which are Kagan like strategies.

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

*Instructional strategies will included instructional strategies learning as part of our collaborative book study using Total Participation Techniques, which are Kagan like strategies holding all students accountable for their learning.
*District Curriculum Resource Teachers will assist with training teachers with the use of resources embedded in each core curriculum map.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 50%, ELA Learning Gains were 52%, and the Lowest Quartile performed at 40%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and ELL which performed at 22% and 23% respectively.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase ELA overall proficiency from 50% to 56%. Increase ELA Lowest Quartile learning gains from 40% to 47%, including ESSA subgroups, SWD and ELL. Teachers use of Total Participation Techniques will indicate standard aligned student activities versus teacher activity is at least 50% higher. This will hold teachers accountable for planning learning instruction and activities which hold students accountable for their own learning.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This Area of Focus will be monitored through bi-weekly classroom visits using a walkthrough tool with specific standard aligned ELA look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments designed weekly during collaborative planning to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom visits and student performance data. Feedback will be given weekly upon classroom visits to include, but not limited to the use of learning targets, success criteria, student activity versus teacher activity, etc.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	John Hattie Collective Teacher Efficacy: Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively to affect students. With an effect size of 1.57, Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	A school staff that believes it can collectively accomplish great things is vital for the health of a school and if they believe they can believe a positive difference than they very likely will. It's effect size of 1.57 is more than two times larger than that of feedback (0.72) and almost three time bigger than that of classroom management (0.52). Together teachers can achieve more, especially if they collectively believe they can do so.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Total Participation Book Study
Teacher Generated Mini Session addressing best practices and instructional strategies including but not
limited to technology, student engagement strategies, classroom management, and specific content area
professional development.

Person Responsible	Tiffanee Cook-Grant (ttcookgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff the data the SLT examined that determined the need for
implementation of Teacher Efficacy.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Efficacy during ERPLs and Teacher Duty Day. Teams
will also engage in ongoing teacher efficacy during PLC/faculty meetings and integrate the following types
of questions/reflections into their discussions: What did we learn today? Share success stories of TPT
Book Study use (student self ratings, etc.).

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that included planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark,
the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teacher "doing the work: to provide worked examples
that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets, discuss TPT ideas for instruction, review student
work/data analysis, and determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be
successful.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Cascio (jlcascio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Investigate the possible use and implementation of a writing program, Top Score Writing.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborate with District ELA Resource Teacher after district assessment data analysis for resources to
include instructional practices, interventions and enrichment activities.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

To increase student engagement and on-task time in class, PBIS will be implemented.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaching cycles based on teacher need.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Cascio (jlcascio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 50%, Math Learning Gains were 65%, and the Lowest Quartile performed at 56%. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and ELL with 7% and 35% respectively reaching an achievement level of three or higher.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase Math overall proficiency from 50% to 54%. Maintain Math Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains at no lower than 54%. Teachers use of Total Participation Techniques will indicate standard aligned student activities versus teacher activities is at least 50% higher. This will hold the teacher accountable when planning for instruction and learning activities, as well as hold students accountable for their own learning.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This Area of Focus will be monitored through bi-weekly classroom visits using a walkthrough tool with specific standard aligned Math look-fors, including but not limited to turn and talks, and PLC data chats, which occur 2 to 3 times a month, to determine instructional adjustments designed weekly during collaborative planning to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Feedback will be given upon classroom visits and will include, but not limited to Learning targets, success criteria, student learning activities during the lesson versus teacher activities during the lesson.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	John Hattie Collective Teacher Efficacy: Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively to affect students. With an effect size of 1.57, Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-	A school staff that believes it can collectively accomplish great things is vital for the health of a school and if they believe they can believe a positive difference than they very

based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	likely will. It's effect size of 1.57 is more than two times larger than that of feedback (0.72) and almost three time bigger than that of classroom management (0.52). Together teachers can achieve more, especially if they collectively believe they can do so.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Total Participation Book Study
Teacher Generated Mini Session addressing best practices and instructional strategies including but not limited to technology, student engagement strategies, classroom management, and specific content area professional development.

Person Responsible	Tiffanee Cook-Grant (ttcookgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Efficacy.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Efficacy during ERPLs and Teacher Duty Day. Teams will also engage in ongoing teacher efficacy during PLC/faculty meetings and integrate the following types of questions/reflections into their discussions: What did we learn today? Share success stories of TPT Book Study use (student self ratings, etc.).

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that included planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teacher "doing the work: to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets, discuss TPT ideas for instruction, review student work/data analysis, and determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Cascio (jlcascio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Investigate the possible use and implementation of online programs to support learning (IXL, Flocabulary).

Person Responsible	Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborate with District Math Resource Teacher after district assessment data analysis for resources to include instructional practices, interventions and enrichment activities.

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

To increase student engagement and on-task time in class, PBIS will be implemented.

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaching cycles based on teacher need.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Cascio (jlcascio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Since the 2017-2018 school year, our school has seen an overall downward trend in science achievement. Achievement levels have gone from 66 to 64 to 59 to 54 respectively since that 17-18 school year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase Science Proficiency from 54% to 58%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations with feedback provided to teachers for further growth and support, monitoring local assessments, and data chats during PLCs to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	John Hattie Collective Teacher Efficacy: Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively to affect students. With an effect size of 1.57, Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	A school staff that believes it can collectively accomplish great things is vital for the health of a school and if they believe they can believe a positive difference than they very likely will. It's effect size of 1.57 is more than two times larger than that of feedback (0.72) and almost three time bigger than that of classroom management (0.52). Together teachers can achieve more, especially if they collectively believe they can do so.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Total Participation Book Study
Teacher Generated Mini Session addressing best practices and instructional strategies including but not limited to technology, student engagement strategies, classroom management, and specific content area professional development.

Person Responsible   Tiffanee Cook-Grant (ttcookgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Efficacy.

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Efficacy during ERPLs and Teacher Duty Day. Teams will also engage in ongoing teacher efficacy during PLC/faculty meetings and integrate the following types of questions/reflections into their discussions: What did we learn today? Share success stories of TPT Book Study use (student self ratings, etc.).

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that included planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teacher "doing the work: to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets, discuss TPT ideas for instruction, review student work/data analysis, and determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Cascio (jlcascio@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Investigate the possible use and implementation of online programs to support learning (PENDA, Flocabulary).

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Collaborate with District Science Resource Teacher after district assessment data analysis for resources to include instructional practices, interventions and enrichment activities.

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

To increase student engagement and on-task time in class, PBIS will be implemented.

Person Responsible   Susan Tuten (smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In our primary grades students took the i-Ready diagnostic assessment 3 times throughout the 21-22 school year. The final data from Diagnostic 3 was as follows:
Kindergarten - 0% of students were Tier 3, 13% of students were Tier 2, while 87% were Tier 1; Phonics, High Frequency, Vocabulary and Informational comprehension showed 21% or higher placed within the Tier 2 level in the final diagnostic.
First Grade - 2% Tier 3, 42% Tier 2, and 56% were Tier 1; Phonics, vocabulary, and both informational and literary comprehension strands showed 40% or higher placed within the Tier 2 level in the final diagnostic.
Second Grade - 20% Tier 3, 33% Tier 2, 48% Tier 1 overall placement. Phonics, vocabulary and comprehension in both literary and informational text are concerns as more than 50% of students assessed fell within the Tier 2/Tier 3 placement on the final diagnostic.
Grade level data points analyzed found that 2nd grade Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA will be an area of focus during the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 50%, ELA Learning Gains were 52%, and the Lowest Quartile performed at 40%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and ELL which performed at 22% and 23% respectively.
FSA Data
3rd grade percent proficient: 39%
4th grade percent proficient: 53%
5th grade percent proficient: 50%
Third grade was found to have performed below the 50% proficiency threshold on the statewide English Language Arts Assessment. As a result of student performance below both the district and state averages it was determined that Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA to be an Area of Focus during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades K-2 ELA student proficiency will increase overall during the 2022-2023 school year. The newly implemented progress monitoring (F.A.S.T.) assessment data will show an increase in student proficiency from Assessment 1 to Assessment 3. 55% or higher of students in first and second grade will be proficient by assessment 3 of the FAST.
The goal is for each of the three grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency during the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades 3-5 ELA student proficiency will increase overall from 50% to 55%. Individual grade levels will increase overall student proficiency:
3rd grade from 39% to 55%
4th grade from 53% to 55%
5th grade from 50% to 55%
The goal is for each of the three grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency during the 2022-2023 school year and to achieve a minimum of two grade levels with 50% or more students performing at proficiency.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through bi-weekly classroom visits using a walkthrough tool with specific standard aligned ELA look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments designed weekly during collaborative planning to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom visits and student performance data. Feedback will be given weekly upon classroom visits to include, but not limited to the use of learning targets, success criteria, student activity versus teacher activity, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tuten, Susan, smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

John Hattie Collective Teacher Efficacy: Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively to affect students. With an effect size of 1.57, Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

A school staff that believes it can collectively accomplish great things is vital for the health of a school and if they believe they can believe a positive difference than they very likely will. It's effect size of 1.57 is more than two times larger than that of feedback (0.72) and almost three time bigger than that of classroom management (0.52). Together teachers can achieve more, especially if they collectively believe they can do so.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership- benchmark-aligned instruction will be used to promote a culture of literacy and will be monitored to ensure all students are exposed to grade level tasks. Literacy Coaching- ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on understanding newly implemented benchmarks. The ELA Coach will provide support with delivery of instruction, lesson modeling, and planning in collaborative planning. Assessment- use of collaborative planning structures will help teachers assess their understanding of benchmarks and reflect on benchmark aligned instruction. Professional Learning- Teachers will continue to engage in Professional Learning to deepen their understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and practices designed to enhance student mastery of the content/concepts taught.	Tuten, Susan, smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership - Data Analysis: monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and Monthly School Leadership Team Meetings. Academic Coach, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and 3 students through progress monitoring will occur and instructional decisions made to increase student achievement. Literacy Coaching- ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on identifying leveled groups based on benchmarks not mastered. In addition, the Intervention teacher will work with Tier 2 & 3 students to remediate areas of focus. Assessment- Unit Assessments will be administered after each unit. Assessment results will be progress monitored by administration. Professional Learning- Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during ERPLs on the MTSS process to learn structures and strategies to improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and student achievement.	Tuten, Susan, smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership- Calibration Walks/Learning will help ensure benchmark and tasks alignment. Calibration Walks/Learning Walks will promote a culture of literacy for both teachers and students. Feedback about frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks will be shared with teachers. Literacy Coaching- School Leadership/District Specialists will provide coaching and feedback to teachers focused on school-wide lookfors: frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks. Teachers will engage in Coaching Cycles and feedback will be provided by the ELA Coach as well. Assessment- District Assessments will be administered after each unit. Assessment results will be progress monitored by administration and teachers during PLCs. Professional Learning- Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during PLCs and Collaborative Planning focused on Differentiated Instruction and how to strategically group students based on skills/benchmarks not mastered.	Tuten, Susan, smtuten@volusia.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

MCE is implementing PBIS this school year. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed. PBIS establishes a baseline for appropriate behavior, outlining interventions and supports for behavior that strays from this baseline. Unlike traditional punitive systems of discipline, PBIS focuses on recognizing positive behaviors. Struggling students receive a boost in self-esteem for appropriate behavior. These small victories build upon one another, from student to student, lifting the class as a whole.

In addition, we are revitalizing our House System. Our system is based on the Ron Clark Academy House System and features four houses — our learning and leadership communities for students. Each House has unique properties such as its own color, symbols, nation of heritage, history, and more. Over time, each House also starts to take on its own values and personality driven by the culture of the students and staff within it. Students can earn points for their house through academics and through positive behavior. The House System will walk hand-in-hand with PBIS to encourage our students to build a strong learning community.

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

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

Our Parent Liaison has coordinated events such as Science night with The Museum of Arts and Sciences and Math Night; our fourth and fifth grade teaching teams have hosted Social Studies Fair Information Night and Science Fair Information Night respectively, and our kindergarten team has hosted the Story Book Parade.