

Volusia County Schools

Blue Lake Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Blue Lake Elementary School

282 N BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

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

Demographics

Principal: Holly Bailey

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

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
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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (39%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI

* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Blue Lake Elementary School

282 N BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/bluelake/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	64%

School Grades History

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

Blue Lake Elementary School is a Professional Learning Community committed to standards based instruction, small group intervention, and teacher collaboration to help ensure students reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Bailey, Holly	Principal	To oversee the day to day operation of the school, including but not limited to, implementation of MTSS, weekly PLC meetings with data analysis, ensuring the safety and security of the campus, monitoring the PST process and early warning systems, and monitoring progress towards SIP Goals.
Benton, Stinette	Assistant Principal	Assists principal with overseeing day operation of the school, including but not limited to, implementation of MTSS, weekly PLC meetings with data analysis, ensuring the safety and security of the campus, monitoring the PST process and early warning systems, and monitoring progress towards SIP Goals.
Edwards, Emily	Reading Coach	To provide professional learning opportunities and classroom support for teachers to facilitate improvement in the delivery and effectiveness of instruction in the critical areas of education that will enhance teacher quality and effectiveness to foster increased student achievement for all students.
Williams, Heather M	Math Coach	To provide professional learning opportunities and classroom support for teachers to facilitate improvement in the delivery and effectiveness of instruction in the critical areas of education that will enhance teacher quality and effectiveness to foster increased student achievement for all students.
Reid, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Kelly, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Miller, Terri	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Sylvia, Ronda	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fogle, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Cooper, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Dunlap, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Fontanez, Darlene	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/1/2021, Holly Bailey

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

550

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

11

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

11

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	77	87	89	85	83	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	34	34	34	25	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	4	3	5	2	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	34	39	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	16	15	8	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	7	10	10	27	26	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	77	87	86	96	76	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	15	15	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	8	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	2	12	6	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	5	2	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	77	87	86	96	76	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	15	15	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	8	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	2	12	6	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	5	2	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	35%	53%	56%				37%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						38%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						48%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	32%	42%	50%				49%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						47%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						36%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	55%	59%				47%	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	43%	58%	-15%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

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	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	56%	-13%	53%	-10%
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	10	15	15	11	40	41	32				
ELL	25	35	17	23	44	47	35				
BLK	25	53		15	44	50	25				
HSP	30	34	20	25	39	44	39				
MUL	17			50							
WHT	46	45		45	47		60				
FRL	31	41	33	26	39	44	35				

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	11	17	30	14	17	20	11				
ELL	25	30		27	43		28				
BLK	18	27		23	20		21				
HSP	28	40		31	38		25				
WHT	37	24		39	41		35				
FRL	27	30	23	30	31	25	24				
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	13	28	33	19	33	29	37				
ELL	24	33	45	42	41	39	26				
BLK	35	29	45	38	43	29	45				
HSP	32	36	40	48	41	33	31				
WHT	45	45		60	56	50	70				
FRL	35	36	49	47	45	35	44				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
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 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	49
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

According to FSA ELA, the number of students who demonstrated proficiency increased from 29% to 35%. According to the Florida Statewide Science Assessment, the number of students who demonstrated proficiency increased from 27% to 40%. FSA Math proficiency remained the same: 32%. 3rd and 4th grade ELA stayed the same: 35% and 31% (unscrubbed data). 5th grade ELA increase from 25% to 35%. 3rd grade math increased from 24% to 37%; 4th grade math decreased from 37% to 30%; 5th grade math increased from 26% to 30%.

For the ESSA subgroups the overall data indicate the following proficiency: 40% for African American students, 33% for Hispanic students, 23% for SWD, and 32% for ELL students.

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

Our ELA and Math proficiency demonstrate the greatest need: 35% and 32%. Our greatest need for subgroups are SWD and ELL students overall achievement.

When analyzing student cohort groups for FSA and progress monitoring data, 4th grade ELA showed the greatest drops in proficiency, by 4%. The 5th grade cohort decreased the most in math proficiency, according to FSA and progress monitoring data, by 7%. According to FSA and progress monitoring, the 4th grade cohort increased in math proficiency from their third grade year to their 4th grade year.

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 are the number of students with foundation reading and math skills deficiencies. The new actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement are increasing the amount of data chats for monitoring WTI and intervention math groups. Another contributing factor for this needed improvement is the adoption of new ELA benchmarks and textbook adoption, resulting in a lack of teacher mastery of the new benchmarks and resources. We will systematically provide weekly collaborative planning for each grade level with content expert to support the teachers.

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

5th grade science overall achievement, according to district progress monitoring and Florida Statewide Science Assessment, went from 27% proficient to 40% proficient, an increase of 13%. Math lowest quartile learning gains from 25% to 46%, an increase of 21%. ELA learning gains went from 32% to 44%, an increase of 12%.

The 4th grade cohort had the largest increase in the math from 24% in third grade year to 30% for 4th grade; an increase of 6%.

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

Science: Receiving district support from the science curriculum department, implementing science intervention groups, using district provided question of the day, additional instructional time for hands on science experiments, and using targeted data of fair game standards to drive instruction. The Science district coach focused on supporting teachers in planning for benchmarks-aligned tasks and lessons.

Math Lowest Quartile: Intervention groups and district support for small group instruction, and instructing with the same MAFS that teachers were already familiar with.

ELA Learning Gains: Targeted intervention groups based on student need, district support for small group instruction, and an "all hands on deck" approach to meeting student needs.

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

- 1.) Continue Walk to Intervention- school wide (intervention groups based on student need).
- 2.) Continue collaborative planning with additional content expert support for grade level teams.
- 3.) Strategically utilizing pockets of time and intervention teachers during the school day to increase instructional time for students who demonstrate need.
- 4.) SEL TOA is in place to provide SEL support for students as well as a sensory room.
- 5.) Additional Reading intervention teacher to provide more support for students.
- 6.) Implementing targeted walk-throughs with specific "look-fors" in conjunction with consistent feedback and reflection.

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.

We will facilitate the following professional learning:

MTSS will be a year-long district driven professional learning.

Correctly and properly providing ESE accommodations.

Reading Ongoing Progress Monitoring.

New math benchmarks planning and preparation.

ELA benchmarks planning and preparation.

Responsive Classroom (SEL) Power of Our Words.

Training for SEL classroom "zones of regulation".

SIPPS training and side by side coaching.

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

In addition, we will be implementing tutoring for students, Stocktake meetings, which analyze the district assessment data with the School Leadership Team for the purpose of monitoring the SIP and progress toward effective implementation. Mentoring for new teachers will also be provided to increase teacher retention. Tutoring will take place before school and after school in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. In addition, we will offer science time during media special area to cover the fair game standards in 3rd-5th grade. Furthermore, each new teacher will receive a lead mentor and a grade level curriculum chair for support. The lead mentor will provide monthly professional learning opportunities for new teachers. We will be implementing and strategically monitoring instructional practices and providing feedback.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The data indicates, based on proficiency from FSA ELA, Math and Science, our students achievement level are 41% or lower. ELA: 35%; Math: 32%; Science: 41%. Therefore, we need to improve the instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction across all content areas and pedagogical practices.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Learner outcome: We will increase our ELA proficiency from 35% to 54% on CSPM and district assessments; Math proficiency from 32% to 54% on CSPM and district assessments; Science proficiency from 41% to 54% on Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

Walk through data, aligned with our SIP Area of Focus, will be used to measure fidelity of implementation, in order to improve teacher practice.

Teacher practice: By May 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthrough data.

Coaching Practice: By May 2023, the number of teachers receiving tier 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The state and district ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor growth toward the goal of proficiency. The district assessments and progress checks will also be utilized throughout the year to determine growth toward student proficiency. PLCs will be utilized to analyze data and create plans of instruction for intervention and enrichment.

MTSS will be monitored through the fidelity of implementing appropriate Tier instruction for Tier 2 and 3 students, based on student need, as identified by district ongoing progress assessments.

OPM training will be monitored by the teacher fidelity of implementation and utilization of district-provided, research based diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments for foundational reading skills.

Collaborative planning will be monitored via planning deliverables and instructional implementation that demonstrates benchmark-aligned lessons and tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

An evidence-based strategy that will be utilized to implement standards-aligned instruction will be RTI. RTI, according to John Hattie, has a high-impact effect size of 1.07.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Utilizing RTI offers instructional guidance, based on student data, for teachers to meet the needs of students. RTI is a research-based data-driven process that addresses student needs in Tier 1, 2, and 3. By utilizing RTI, every student's need will be met in a diagnostic, prescriptive, and flexible way.

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.

MTSS training will be offered throughout the year in prescriptive, district-provided way.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

OPM training will be offered for an ERPL training for addressing student needs.

Person Responsible Emily Edwards (eedward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students in math and higher order questioning and benchmark aligned tasks in ELA.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Tier teachers based on instructional walk through and assessment data, using the Skill/Will Matrix, to determine level of coaching support. Create coaching schedule indicating focus, frequency and level of support.

Person Responsible Emily Edwards (eedward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

During PLCs, grade levels will analyze the data with guidance from the coaches to monitor student proficiency and growth on both chapter tests in math and unit assessments in ELA. Monitoring of science data through SMTs and VSTs will also occur. Additionally data from our LQ and ESSA subgroups will be monitored for progress.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review coaching logs/progress with coaches in weekly leadership meeting

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

For the ESSA subgroups the overall data indicate the following proficiency: 40% for African American students, 33% for Hispanic students, 23% for SWD, and 32% for ELL students.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the ESSA subgroups the overall data will indicate the following improved proficiency: 54% for African American students, 54% for Hispanic students, 54% for SWD, and 54% for ELL students.
Teacher practice: By May of 2023, 90% of teachers will provide appropriate interventions to students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 support, with integrity and fidelity.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The state ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor growth toward the goal of proficiency. The district assessments and progress checks will also be utilized throughout the year to determine growth toward student proficiency. PLCs will be utilized to analyze data and create plans of instruction for intervention and enrichment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stinette Benton (sdbenton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

An evidence-based strategy that will be utilized to implement standards-aligned instruction will be RTI. RTI, according to John Hattie, has a high-impact effect size of 1.07.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Utilizing RTI offers instructional guidance, based on student data, for teachers to meet the needs of students. RTI is a research-based data-driven process that addresses student needs in Tier 1, 2, and 3. By utilizing RTI, every student's need will be met in a diagnostic, prescriptive, and flexible way.

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.

MTSS training will be offered throughout the year in prescriptive, district-provided way.

Person Responsible

Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE Specific Professional Learning will take place for ESE teachers and ESE Accommodations for non-ESE teachers training will be offered for an ERPL training for addressing student needs.

Person Responsible

Stinette Benton (sdbenton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible

Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly PLC to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on Unit/Chapter Assessments in ELA and Math.

Bi-weekly checkpoints of targeted students - make adjustments to the intervention, as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL.
Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of LQ students through walkthroughs. Students that continue to need further supports/intervention would be identified in order to move them to Tier 3.

Person Responsible Emily Edwards (eedward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor instruction/accommodations of ESSA subgroups in the general education classroom and in small groups with ESE/ELL teachers through weekly walkthroughs providing feedback

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Student behaviors, such as physical & verbal aggression, have increased in recent years as indicated by increases in incidents of physical aggression & increases in Office Discipline Referrals. Additionally, district data shows disproportionate discipline of minority students and students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Learner: During the 2021-22 SY, 31.58% of VCS schools indicated an ineffective Core behavioral instruction & fidelity. An effective Core was indicated at a rate of 68.42%. Our goal will be to increase effective Core behavioral instruction to 75% during the 2022-23 SY.

Teacher practice: We will utilize PBIS implementation Checklist data & Benchmarks of Quality data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing discipline Referrals and suspensions of all student subgroups.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored in the fall, spring and year's end through the implementation checklists and Benchmarks of Quality surveys. Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored both at the district level and school level monthly during PBIS PLCs to increase core instruction in behavior for all students and intensifying monitoring of disproportionate rates of discipline.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through district-wide MTSS framework. Outcomes will be measured & monitored:

- 1.) Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS planning team and by the school based PBIS PLCs on a monthly basis.
- 2.) Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the PBIS District Coordinator, Dr. Mandy Ellzey, following the close of the reporting windows for fall reporting, spring reporting and year

being

implemented for this Area of Focus. end. This data will also be monitored by the PBIS teams to be used for progress monitoring and planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy: PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making. Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). These assessments contains 53-items divided into ten critical elements that make up an effective PBIS Tier 1 system. Completion of the BoQ produces scale and subscale scores indicating the extent to which these critical elements are in place.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

New Tier 1 Schools trained in summer, 2022.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures.

Person Responsible Jennifer Reid (jrreid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly PBIS PLCs closely follow Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) Year-at-a-Glance 2022-23 SY for monthly PBIS Goals and activities

Person Responsible Jennifer Reid (jrreid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data

Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

Person Responsible Stinette Benton (sdbenton@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

Kindergarten below grade level: 21% of students based on iReady diagnostic 3 progress monitoring.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on iReady diagnostic data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

1st grade below grade level: 62% of students based on iReady diagnostic 3 progress monitoring.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on iReady diagnostic data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

2nd grade below grade level: 53% of students based on iReady diagnostic 3 progress monitoring.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on iReady diagnostic data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

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

3rd grade below grade level: 64% of students based on 2022 FSA data end of year.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on FSA data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

4th grade below grade level: 69% of students based on 2022 FSA data end of year.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on FSA data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

5th grade below grade level: 65% of students based on 2022 FSA data end of year.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on FSA data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

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)

K-3: We plan on achieving 54% proficiency for each grade level at Blue Lake in reading.

Kindergarten 2022 end of year data: 21% below grade level, therefore, 79% were on track to be on grade level by 3rd grade. Base on this, we can reasonably anticipate at least 54% of our current Kindergarteners will be on grade level by the end of the year based on CSPM.

1st grade 2022 end of year data: 62% below grade level, therefore, 38% were on track to be on grade level by 3rd grade. Base on this, we are aiming for at least 54% of our current 1st graders will be on grade level by the end of the year based on CSPM.

2nd grade 2022 end of year data: 53% below grade level, therefore, 47% were on track to be on grade level by 3rd grade. Base on this, we can are aiming at least 54% of our current 2nd graders will be on grade level by the end of the year based on CSPM.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

K-3: We plan on achieving 54% proficiency for each grade level at Blue Lake in reading.

3rd grade 2022 end of year FSA data: 64% below grade level, therefore, 36% were on grade level.

Based on this, we are aiming for at least 54% of our current 3rd graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on CSPM.

4th grade 2022 end of year FSA data: 69% below grade level, therefore, 31% were on grade level.

Based on this, we are aiming for at least 54% of our current 4th graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on CSPM.

5th grade 2022 end of year FSA data: 65% below grade level, therefore, 35% were on grade level.

Based on this, we are aiming for at least 54% of our current 5th graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on CSPM.

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.

Area of Focus 1 for Instructional Practice: Improving Tier 1 Instruction through the action steps of collaborative ongoing MTSS professional learning, Ongoing Progress Monitoring professional learning, and weekly collaborative planning and preparation with a content area expert to support present.

Area Focus 1 will be monitored with CSPM reading and early literacy data for each grade level, district ELA assessments, and ongoing progress monitoring using district provided, research-based diagnostic screeners and monitoring tools. Weekly PLCs will be utilized to monitor, analyze and prescribe action steps based on the above collected data. Monitoring the data consistently throughout the school year will compel us to be proactive with adjusting instruction and interventions to address the needs the student data reveals. By monitoring the data throughout the year, we will be able to work toward our proficiency goals for each grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bailey, Holly, hmbailey@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?

MTSS professional learning will take place throughout the year and is district-driven. A branch under MTSS is RTI (response to intervention). RTI will be utilized for K-5 to monitor interventions and student progression of reading skills. The effect size for RTI (Hattie research) is 1.07, which is a strong effect size. The practice of using the RTI model to monitor student progress meets Florida's definition of a strong evidence-based practice.

Resources utilized during WTI (an RTI model) are all aligned with B.E.S.T. ELA standards: SIPPS foundational skills reading program, Benchmark Advance Curriculum, and Magnetic Reading (formerly Ready Reading).

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?

The above resources are chosen based on district-provided Reading Decision Trees, which only suggest research-based programs that are derived from the science of reading.

SIPPS: Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words. This program is a research-based reading program that is utilized for our K-3 grade students to sequentially and systematically directly teach and apply the foundational skills of reading. The skills taught in SIPPS align with BEST standards and the science of reading. When implemented with fidelity, the SIPPS program has achievement results that demonstrated greater success than control groups who do not receive SIPPS. Benchmark Advance Curriculum is tightly aligned with the BEST standards and has shown success when implemented with fidelity.

Magnetic Reading is aligned with the BEST Standards, and when implemented with fidelity, has shown success for student outcomes.

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
<p>MTSS district-driven professional learning</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Data will be monitored and analyzed by the Literacy Leadership team throughout the year to determine effectiveness of implementation and impact.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Content-specific coaches (school-based reading coach and district-based reading coaches) will support classroom teachers with instructional decision-making based on student needs.</p> <p>Assessment: District assessments and CSPM will be monitored with the goal of progressing 54% to students to proficiency.</p> <p>Professional Learning: 4 two hour professional learning sessions throughout the school year.</p>	<p>Bailey, Holly, hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Ongoing Progress Monitoring Professional Training</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Diagnostic and prescriptive data will be monitored and analyzed by the Literacy Leadership team throughout the year to determine effectiveness of implementation and impact.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Content-specific coaches (school-based reading coach and district-based reading coaches) will support classroom teachers with instructional decision-making based on student needs from the ongoing progress monitoring.</p> <p>Assessment: District assessments and CSPM will be monitored with the goal of progressing 54% to students to proficiency. Ongoing Progress Monitoring of reading foundational skills will be analyzed and properly acted upon by classroom teachers and coaches to progress students through to proficiency.</p> <p>Professional Learning: A two hour professional learning session is scheduled for the beginning of the school year to support teachers with the initial implementation of ongoing progress monitoring. Follow up to the professional learning will take place through coaching and PLCs.</p>	<p>Edwards, Emily, eeedward@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Collaborative Planning</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Walkthrough data will be monitored and analyzed by the Literacy Leadership team throughout the year to determine effectiveness of implementation and impact.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Content-specific coaches (school-based reading coach and district-based reading coaches) will support classroom teachers with instructional decision-making based on data from Tier 1 instruction. Benchmark aligned instruction and tasks will be the focus.</p> <p>Assessment: District assessments and CSPM will be monitored with the goal of progressing 54% to students to proficiency. Assessment data will be taken into account when planning for benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks.</p> <p>Professional Learning: One two-hour professional learning for ELA collaboration will take place during the school year in conjunction with weekly collaborative planning. During both professional learnings, content-specific coaches will be present to support teachers lesson design to be benchmark aligned.</p>	<p>Bailey, Holly, hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>

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.

Blue Lake Elementary will implement a new PBIS program this school year. A PBIS leadership team created common schoolwide expectations for all common areas. We will continue to award positive house points through the use of our house system. Additionally, we will highlight our "terrific kids" through the use of bulletin boards and weekly announcements. Weekly, our school counselor will also provide us with a "word of the week" which will be incorporated into SEL, and social media posts. Furthermore, we will use positive "Dynamic Dolphin" referrals for individual students and Dolphin Pride Passes for exemplary class behaviors. We plan to implement awards for students who achieve academic goals.

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

Teachers: Incentivize students/ SEL daily/ Model desired behaviors/ Mentor students (Dolphin to Dolphin)
 Students: Conflict mediation/ Building relationships/ Student voice through surveys/Collaborating through the house system to build relationships.
 Families of students: Follow the Title 1 Compact agreement
 Volunteers: Assist as needed throughout the year with students/ participate as a mentor, events and celebrations/ Rotary club to mentor students
 School Board Members: Highlight us on Social media, read to students
 Colleges and universities: Stetson Professional Development School/participate in SAC/One book one school/Walk to school day
 Master Gardener program through University of Florida (UF/IFAS)
 Social Service: House Next Door which provides counseling services
 Community Partners: Jewish foundation which provides school supplies/ Junior Service League provides jackets and clothing/ American Legion provides school supplies and helps to assist students with community service projects/ Volusia Fuel provides food for students/Deland Dawgs mentor students/ Deland High Achievers supply reading assistance to students.
 Business Partners: Jeremiah's Ice contributes a monetary donation of 50/50/ Forever Snowie/Tijuana Flats/ Sweet Spot