

Volusia County Schools

Edgewater Public School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Edgewater Public School

801 S OLD COUNTY RD, Edgewater, FL 32132

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

Demographics

Principal: Sharon Lavallee

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (58%) 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Edgewater Public School

801 S OLD COUNTY RD, Edgewater, FL 32132

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/edgewater/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 | 18% |

School Grades History

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

"All stakeholders at Edgewater Public will affect positive change in our school, community, and beyond as we develop our skills in communication, creativity, critical thinking and collaboration."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Through the shared responsibility of all, we will provide a safe learning environment that fosters commitment, collaboration, and creativity in a changing world."

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Lavallee, Sharon | Principal | |
| Johnson, Robin | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Flanagan, Gina | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Amato, Melanie | Instructional Coach | |
| Mowrey, Keri | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Bryer, Kyle | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2021, Sharon Lavallee

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

485

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

7

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

7

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 | 68 | 72 | 82 | 77 | 81 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 452 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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

Monday 8/1/2022

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 | 76 | 79 | 79 | 85 | 72 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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

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

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | |

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 | 76 | 79 | 79 | 85 | 72 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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

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

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | | |

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 | 57% | 53% | 56% | | | | 48% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | | | | | | 49% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | | | | | | 30% | 46% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 66% | 42% | 50% | | | | 55% | 59% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | | | | | | 52% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | | | | | | 36% | 43% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 71% | 55% | 59% | | | | 55% | 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 | 45% | 58% | -13% | 58% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 58% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 48% | 54% | -6% | 56% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |

| 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 | 67% | 60% | 7% | 62% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 59% | 5% | 64% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 60% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 56% | -4% | 53% | -1% |
| 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 | 21 | 39 | 27 | 32 | 44 | 38 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 45 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 58 | 43 | 70 | 63 | 48 | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 56 | 46 | 60 | 56 | 42 | 67 | | | | |
| 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 | 31 | 73 | 73 | 27 | 53 | | 29 | | | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 18 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 69 | 69 | 65 | 67 | 58 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 53 | 54 | 59 | 63 | 60 | 58 | | | | |
| 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 | 23 | 33 | 28 | 26 | 35 | 30 | 32 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | | | 31 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | | | 68 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 49 | 29 | 56 | 52 | 38 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 44 | 32 | 52 | 48 | 32 | 51 | | | | |

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 | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 407 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 39 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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?

The trends that stand out across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas show improvement in Math, ELA and Science achievement data over the last two years..

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

The greatest need for improvement according to the data components are fourth grade ELA achievement, our Lowest Quartile Students achievement in ELA and Math, Students with Disabilities and ELL students.

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 is having a new teacher to the grade level. Teacher placement has been adjusted to help address this need for improvement and Intervention teachers will focus on this grade level needs.

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

The data components showed the most improvement in Science achievement.

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

The contributing factors to the science achievement improvement include the Science Department TOAs visiting during PLCs, science tutoring, and schoolwide STEM implementation.

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

In order to accelerate learning our school strategies will focus on our Lowest Quartile students, complete training on new math curriculum and small group instruction.

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

The professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders at our school include new math curriculum training, small group PLCs, PST training, and STEM training.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include tutoring, intervention teachers and curriculum resource teachers during PLCs.

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.

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage ALL students in high levels of learning EVERY day. Results from the Florida Standards Assessment show that students in the Lowest Quartile overall achievement dropped 17% in both ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal will be to increase the percentage of our lowest quartile students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade achieving a 3 or higher from 46% to 56%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through Progress Monitoring, VLTs, Data Chats, Administrative Walkthroughs and PLCs..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

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.

Finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for intervention support.

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Introduce student and teacher data tracking information sheets.

Person Responsible

Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible

Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on new math curriculum.

Person Responsible

Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Semester Data Chats with teachers.

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct progress monitoring every 5-6 weeks with ESE and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and Feedback.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction.

Person Responsible Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct progress monitoring every 5-6 weeks with ESE and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct weekly PLC meetings for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions.

Person Responsible Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Tutoring to improve student achievement in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Analyze District Math and ELA student achievement to form intervention groups.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage ALL students in high levels of learning EVERY day. The results from VST and Science Topic Checks show inconsistent data.

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

Our goal is to maintain the percentage of students achieving a 3 or higher on the Science FSA at 71%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through Data Chats, Science Topic Checks, VST, and PLC data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Standards Based Instruction (Science and STEM Instruction)

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

Collective teacher efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 according to John Hattie. Hattie's research also shows that strategy to integrate with prior knowledge has an effect size of .93.

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.

Review of previous science district and state assessments.

Person Responsible Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer VST to 3-5th grade students.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate PL on Science Standards and STEM Process.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct progress monitoring meetings every 5-6 weeks to review data to plan instruction.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor science instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Meetings with DLTTL for technology planning support.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coach meets with principal and PLC weekly, and Individual Teachers as aligned with District coaching model.

Person Responsible Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning on PENDA for grades 3-5 teachers.

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Relationships

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, the data shows that in the last school year there were 76 campus disruptions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal will be to decrease the number of campus disruptions from 76 to 66.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through administrative walk throughs. This area will also be monitored through monthly Threat Assessment Meetings and Data Chats which will engage teachers and administration in data analysis of campus disruptions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kyle Bryer (kjbryer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategies being implemented include Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) and Social Emotional Learning (SEL).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

PBIS is a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools, where every student feels valued, connected to the school community and supported by caring adults. Behavioral intervention programs which John Hattie outlined in his work can yield an effect size of .62.

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.

Implement PBIS team.

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Review of Bobcat Powers with faculty

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue use of Positive Referrals

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SEL lessons with Guidance Counselor and classroom teachers

Person Responsible

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@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

Small Group Instruction, Targeted Intervention, Student Data Monitoring

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

Small Group Instruction, Targeted Intervention, Student Data Monitoring

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)

50% of students in K-2 will score at a level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

60% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through Progress Monitoring, VLTs, Data Chats, Administrative Walkthroughs and PLCs..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@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?

Small Group Instruction

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?

Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

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 |
|--|---|
| Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction. | Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Semester Data Chats specifically related to reading assessments. | Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and Feedback. | Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@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.

Edgewater Public School will continue to build positive relationships by increasing our efforts to communicate with our families. We will do this by continued use of our monthly school newsletters and weekly School Messenger calls. We will also provide Title I parent nights to build parent content area knowledge. These nights will provide the expectations for FSA, and more in depth knowledge of what students are learning in class.

Title I meetings include:

1. Title I Annual Meeting
2. Meet the teacher
3. Open House
4. STEM Family night
5. Science Fair
6. Mystery Family Night
7. Book Fair Night
8. Fort Night
9. STEM Night
10. Book Fair Night
11. Science Project Information Night.
- 12.. Title I money is used to provide a Parent Liaison to help build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders.
- 13.. SEL lessons in the classroom with teacher daily

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

Parents- Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Council (SAC) Members, communicate ideas with school

Teachers- Build relationships with students and families.

Principal- Build relationships with students, families, teachers and staff. Communicate with all stakeholders.

Staff- Build relationships with students and families.