

Volusia County Schools

Spirit 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

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Laura Figueroa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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: C (49%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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

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

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/spirit/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	71%

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.

Spirit Elementary is committed to ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to become a responsible, productive citizen able to cope and compete in changing social and economic conditions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spirit believes we are the difference between what is and what could be for students.

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
Devaney, Carrie Ann	Principal	Leading systematic review of all available data throughout the year by school improvement team members to determine the progress of action steps and the effectiveness of identified steps in the action plan and progress toward the measurable outcome. The principal will work to eliminate barriers identified by the team through identified resources.
Goldsmith, William	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mr. Robinson will assist in the systematic review of ongoing student and school data to evaluate the progress of action steps and progress toward measurable outcomes. Mr. Robinson will assist in reducing or eliminating identified barriers, and provide input to the team regarding barriers, resources, and examination of data.
Ephraim, Mikeeta	Math Coach	Ms. Ephraim as an instructional coach will provide input into the barriers facing teachers and students. Ms. Ephraim will work with teachers and the SIP team members to examine the data, reflect on progress and monitor action steps. Ms. Ephraim will assist teachers with pedagogical strategies and techniques to improve instructional outcomes for students. She will help implement a PLC structure that leads teachers through the examination of scaffolding instruction of upcoming standards and ensuring the depth of the standard is being taught to all learners.
TUFARIELLO, DARLENE	Instructional Coach	Ms. Tufariello as an instructional coach will provide input into the barriers facing teachers and students. Ms. Tufariello will work with teachers and the SIP team members to examine the data, reflect on progress and monitor action steps. Ms. Tufariello will assist teachers with pedagogical strategies and techniques to improve instructional outcomes for students. Ms. Tufariello will implement a PLC structure that leads teachers through the examination of scaffolding instruction of upcoming standards and ensuring the depth of the standard is being taught to all learners.
Morales-Torres, Nitza	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Morales as the English for Speakers of Other Languages specialist will ensure the examination of data to include ESOL students. In addition Ms. Morales will work with teachers to ensure this ESSA subgroup of students are being instructed using the WIDA Can Do Descriptors according to their DUESS date and WIDA levels if applicable. Ms. Morales will assist teachers in reviewing the progress data of our ESOL students, providing support with teaching practices and instructional accommodations to assist ESOL student in achieving a proficient understanding of the standards. In addition, Ms. Morales will monitor the action steps, provide input on barriers and successes and reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes.
French, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade instructional leader, responsible for teaching 5th grade ELA. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers, with a focus on ESE. Additionally, she acts as the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, and procedures.
Nation, Shanda	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Nation as the Exceptional Student Education specialist will ensure the examination of data to include students with disabilities. In addition, Ms. Nation will work with teachers to ensure this ESSA subgroup of students are being instructed using the accommodations in their IEP's. Ms. Nation will assist teachers in reviewing the progress data of our ESE students, providing support with teaching practices and instructional accommodations to assist ESE students in achieving a proficient understanding of the standards. In addition, Ms. Nation will monitor the action steps, provide input on barriers and successes, and reflect on our progress toward our measurable outcomes of 42% or higher of ESE students achieving proficiency.
Shank, Aimee	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade instructional leader, responsible for teaching 5th grade ELA. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, and procedures.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Laura Figueroa

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

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

603

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

13

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

14

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	89	102	110	120	109	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	7	19	38	35	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	6	9	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	39	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	34	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	3	1	40	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	100	113	108	101	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	23	29	30	25	24	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
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	2	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	4	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	3	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	100	113	108	101	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	23	29	30	25	24	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
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	2	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	4	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	3	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	49%	53%	56%				46%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						50%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						37%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	42%	50%				49%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						56%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						36%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	55%	59%				49%	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	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

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	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	59%	-18%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	56%	-10%	53%	-7%
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	20	44	46	21	33	26	23				
ELL	39	52	38	37	46	33	47				
BLK	34	33		55	48						
HSP	43	55	40	41	50	40	58				
WHT	61	58	64	58	52	25	70				
FRL	45	54	43	46	52	31	64				

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	23	34	50	23	22	13	23				
ELL	37	38	31	32	26	23	32				
BLK	31	38		41	23		21				
HSP	42	50	29	34	32	21	36				
WHT	61	53		55	37		66				
FRL	46	45	41	39	34	22	44				
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	25	40	29	31	59	50	29				
ELL	38	56	46	40	54	32	33				
BLK	32	32	23	40	56	42	26				
HSP	44	54	43	43	50	25	37				
WHT	50	52	27	53	60	50	64				
FRL	44	48	37	47	56	37	47				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	43
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	49
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	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	50
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?

Based on FSA in grades 3-5 we were able to increase ELA proficiency by 1% and increased 6% in Math achievement.

In Science we had an 18% increase in achievement.

Our 3-5 African American subgroups were able to maintain and improve in ELA and Math achievement, however they lost significant grounds in ELA and Math learning gains. In science they were able to increase achievement by 30%.

Our 3-5 SWD subgroups increased ELA and Math Learning Gains but decreased in achievement and Lowest Quartile. Science remained the same.

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

The greatest need for improvement shows in our 3rd Grade ELA proficiency which showed a decrease from 48% to 41% and our overall ELA Lowest Quartile which showed a decrease from 46% to 45%.

When looking at specific subgroup data for African American Students:

ELA: 34% Achievement (+4% increase) , 33% Learning Gains (-5% decrease) , and 14% in Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile (53% decrease).

Math: 55% Achievement (+14% increase), 48% in Learning Gains (+25% increase), and 0% of Lowest Quartile students made Learning Gains (Same as last year).

When looking at specific subgroup data for Students with Disabilities:

ELA: 20% in Achievement (-5% decrease), 44% in Learning Gains (+10% increase), and 46% in Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities in the Lowest Quartile (-4% decrease).

Math: 20% in Achievement (-2% decrease), 33% in Learning Gains (+11% increase), and 26% in of Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (13% increase).

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

A barrier to achievement and learning gains that we identified this school year was the change in ELA curriculum and teacher knowledge of standards

The new actions that need to be taken would be to provide professional development and coaching using the ELA benchmark materials and standards progression and follow-up training.

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

Our ELL students in ELA learning gains (from 40% to 54%) and overall achievement (from 32% to 43%) and overall Math learning gains (from 34% to 50%) showed the most improvement. Overall Science achievement (from 46% to 64%) also showed significant improvement.

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

The contributing factors include intentional intervention, prioritizing schedule around intervention, communicating with parents. Hands-on science lessons were conducted in grades K-5. Dissecting the data and standards analysis along with standards-based grading also contributed to the improvement. The new actions that were taken were that we added an intervention para, provided tutoring during teacher planning time and after school, and added SIPPS instruction to 3rd grade. Media Specialist provided book clubs focusing on vocabulary and comprehension strategies. Support facilitation students were seen in small groups twice a day.

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

Targeted tutoring, small group instruction, and intervention groups.

Scaffolds for students with content deficits.

Review of assessment data for targeted support

Progress monitoring

Teachers review ELA and math standards in PLC before it is introduced to 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.

During Early Release Professional Development Days there will be a focus on the BEST standards and new math curriculum. During PLCs math experts provide professional development in teaching how to do the math by correctly using manipulatives and correct math vocabulary. Core Connections professional development and support sessions as well as Science of Reading will also be provided through PLC. For ELA, teams collaboratively plan and develop tiered questions and scaffolding strategies to be used during whole group and small group. Support facilitators, intervention teachers and ESOL teachers will be included in the PLC meetings.

During an ERPL-training teachers to train students to track their own data.

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

Additional services include providing students close to proficiency tutoring in ELA and Math content during and after school.

Using SAC funds to provide a stipend to teams that collaboratively team plan in all subjects.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

ESSA subgroup data indicated that students with disabilities in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA and Math achievement as measured on the state assessment. Spirit's students with disabilities performed at a 20% in ELA and 21% in Math.

ESSA Subgroup data indicated that African American students in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA achievement as measured on the state assessment. Overall, Spirit's African American students performed at 36%. The students' achievement in ELA was a 34%.

By January 2023, 35% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA and Math state FAST assessment. 50% of African American students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA state FAST assessment.

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

By May of 2023, 50% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA and Math state FAST assessment. 60% of African American students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA state FAST assessment.

As a result of coaching, and PLC collaboration, teachers will be able to disaggregate their own district and state data both holistically and by subgroups to better understand the performance of each group as a whole compared to their peers. The measurable outcome for this goal is for all teachers to be able to respond to the data by creating an intervention and remediation plan to meet individual student needs.

We will utilize the results of the FAST progress monitoring assessments and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the year for African American students and students with disabilities. We will review district assessments and I-Ready diagnostic data through PLCs to determine progress towards our overall goal as well as determine intervention or enrichment needs.

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

Throughout weekly PLC data discussions teachers will identify students that are not making adequate progress towards their goals and take action through the MTSS process. We will know see evidence of implementation and impact of coaching as teachers require less scaffolding to interpret data and make data-driven decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shanda Nation (smnation@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Students with disabilities and identified African American students will receive extended learning time implementing tier 3 researched-based intensive instruction utilizing Wilson phonics programs, Teacher Toolbox lessons and Benchmark Advanced intervention lessons to reduce deficits and increase proficiency on grade-level standards.

Students with disabilities will receive tier 3 research-based intensive instruction in Math using BIG Ideas math intervention and increased usage on reflex.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Data from the Power Bi dashboard illuminated that while our students with disabilities are making learning gains in ELA and math there are still less than 50% of those students making a learning gain in both subject areas.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The data also indicates that learning gains of African American students in the lowest quartile for ELA and Math is significantly lower compared to the LQ LG for the school population and students with disabilities. (ELA: school-45%, SWD-46%, AA-14%) (Math: school-30%, SWD-26%, AA-0%)

We selected the strategy of extending the learning time for students with disabilities and identified African American students using evidence-based curriculum to address increasing the number of students earning a learning gain and continue the progress toward proficiency.

The IReady teacher toolbox for reading and math utilizes a problem solving-based approach that strengthens students' cognitive structures, and builds conceptual understanding through reasoning, practice, and productive discussion using real-world scenarios.

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.

Develop tier 3 intervention schedule for all students with disabilities and African American students in the lowest quartile that does not detract from core instruction, or the specifically designed instruction indicated by their IEP's.

Person Responsible Mikeeta Ephraim (maephrai@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional development focused on utilizing accommodations and scaffolding DOK to increase access to and proficiency of grade-level standards for SWD and LQ AA students.

Person Responsible Shanda Nation (smnation@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review district assessments and I-Ready diagnostic data through weekly PLCs to determine progress towards our overall goal as well as look for necessary modifications of intervention or enrichment plans to increase proficiency of grade-level standards for SWD and LQ AA students.

Person Responsible Shanda Nation (smnation@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evaluate the services and needs of students with disabilities not making progress toward grade-level proficiency every 4 weeks and determine next steps to remove barriers.

Person Responsible Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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.

While proficiency and learning gains for ELA and Math increased on state assessments last year, teachers voiced a need for training on the new Math and ELA standards and curriculum as well as time to analyze the formative assessment data that accompanies the new standards and determine the next steps to increase student achievement on grade-level standards.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Student proficiency in grades 3-5 in ELA and Math will increase by 13% to 62% as measured by state assessment data. (ELA goals- move from 49% in 2022 to 62% in 2023) (Math goals- move from 49% in 2022 to 62% in 2023)

Student proficiency in grades K-2 in ELA and Math will be 80 % as measured by the third F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Coaches, administration, ESE support facilitators, intervention teachers and ESOL teachers will be included in the collaboration during PLCs. Learning walks, visits and coaching cycles will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Teacher Clarity is the evidence-based strategy that will be used. Teachers will collaborate with their colleagues focusing on improving their practice in Math and ELA by analyzing the standards and developing scaffolded questions for whole group and small groups. It will be monitored by administrative walk-throughs and feedback will be given to the teachers during PLC.

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

Teachers need an in-depth understanding of the BEST standards in Math and ELA. For this to occur they need to attend training on the BEST curriculum and standards. Teachers also need an understanding of scaffolding strategies that enable students with deficits to participate in grade-level instruction and achieve success on grade-level standards. Teachers will ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. Teachers will use the curriculum maps and resources from Canvas.

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.

Academic coaches, intervention teachers, and ESE and ESOL support leaders will use PLC time to dissect Math and ELA standards to create learning targets and success criteria. Teams of teachers will be trained in PLC protocol and procedures. They will also analyze progress monitoring formative assessments and determine scaffolding strategies needed for students with deficits.

Person Responsible DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Admin will set aside time for PLC's by planning PLC schedules weekly during the teacher's planning period

Person Responsible Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaches and teachers will review formative data weekly to determine support needed for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on grade-level standards.

Person Responsible DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@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

End of year iReady diagnostic indicates that our overall proficiency in grades K-2 is above 50%, for an average of 68%. The percent of students BELOW proficiency by grade level include Kindergarten is at 9% below proficiency, 1st grade is at 43% below proficiency, and 2nd grade is at 44% below proficiency.

Based on overall proficiency data, an area of focus is to continue to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction of the new standards for students to increase proficiency in ELA with the adoption. To increase proficiency for Tier 2 and 3 students, targeted instruction will need to be purposefully planned.

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

End of year state assessment indicate that our overall proficiency in grades 3-5 is just below 50%, for an average of 49%. The percent of students BELOW proficiency by grade level include third grade is at 59% below proficiency, second grade is at 52% below proficiency, and 5th grade is at 46% below proficiency.

Based on overall proficiency data, an area of focus is to continue to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction of the new standards for students to increase proficiency in ELA with the adoption. To increase proficiency for Tier 2 and 3 students, targeted instruction will need to be purposefully planned.

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)

Increase achievement in ELA from 68% to 78% determined by end of year progress monitoring data.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase achievement in ELA from 49% to 62% determined by the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment.

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.

We will utilize the results of the ELA FAST progress monitoring assessments and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the year for all students. We will review district assessments and I-Ready diagnostic data through PLCs to determine progress towards our overall goal as well as determine intervention or enrichment needs.

Throughout weekly PLC data discussions teachers will identify students that are not making adequate progress towards their goals and take action through the MTSS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

TUFARIELLO, DARLENE, dtufarie@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?

Increase teacher capacity in strategic planning for Tier 1 core instruction and interventions as needed. To accomplish this, we will implement the evidence-based strategy of Multi-tiered System of Supports.

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?

MTSS is based on the on-going analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making to shift from reactive to proactive response to intervention. The effect size of a carefully implemented MTSS is 1.29 according to John Hattie. To implement the new MTSS progress monitoring

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
Review prior year students assessment data to set up intervention groups based on those students' needs. (K-3 i-Ready and 4-5 FSA) Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Strategic planning to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the Decision Rules.	TUFARIELLO, DARLENE, dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning through ERPL's on MTSS systems and structures.	Goldsmith, William, wbgoldsm@volusia.k12.fl.us
Implement professional Learning of MTSS strategies following the District ERPLs. *Decision Rules guidance; Tier 1 - 100% of students receive Tier 1 instruction and at least 80% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. 15% of students receive Tier 2 instruction; 3-5% of students receive intensive Tier 3 instruction level of prevention.	TUFARIELLO, DARLENE, dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us
Weekly assessment data analysis during PLC to include monitoring the progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on district assessments in ELA and Math. Shift students to Tier 3 if further supports/ intervention are identified. Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of students through classroom walkthroughs.	TUFARIELLO, DARLENE, dtufarie@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.

Spirit Elementary uses Class Dojo, Twitter, Facebook and our school website to solicit feedback from stakeholders, share school vision and mission. In addition we share pictures of school, students, achievements and successes on our platforms.

Students are recognized using positive referrals on the morning news. Teachers fill out positive referrals for students who demonstrate our core values: being safe, being kind, being responsible, and being respectful, or showing great improvement in _____. The teachers add comments that are read aloud on the news. The admin team takes pictures with the students who are recognized and they receive a key chain with "you are the difference" embroidered on the back. The student gets a "flag" for their key chain each time they are recognized with a positive referral.

Students are recognized for meeting proficiency on district assessments by the admin team with confetti and a certificate or medal.

Spirit Elementary will hold curriculum events to assist parents in understanding student standards, performance expectations and how they can support their learners at home. Teachers send home instructional calendars that show parents what their students are learning and when as well as assessment calendars.

The school counselor Ms. Shiver will hold tier 2 groups for students who are on tier 2 behavior plans or who struggle with coping or advocacy. Students who do not respond to the small group intervention are recommended to outside agencies such as Children's Home Society for tier 3 or 1:1 support.

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

William Goldsmith and Carrie Devaney- Read Spirit Believes in You awards on the morning news and deliver awards to students receiving awards in the classroom, take a picture and post on our social media accounts.

Michelle Gaetjens-Post pictures on social media

Jacqueline Shiver School Counselor-Post conflict resolution and self-advocacy posters in classrooms and common areas. Provide conflict resolution opportunities for students.

Teachers-Provide calm down corner in classrooms and prompt students to de-escalate when needed. Refer students to school counselor when needed. Use ClassDojo to reward students for following school-wide expectations: Be safe, Be Kind, Be respectful, Be responsible.