

Volusia County Schools

George W. Marks 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

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

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

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Young

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/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	45%

School Grades History

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

Through the cooperative support of the school, family, and community, our students will develop academic and citizenship skills to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

George Marks Elementary, where everyone succeeds together!

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
YOUNG, SHANNON	Principal	<p>Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback</p> <p>Quarterly Data Chat meetings to review, discuss and plan for interventions and enrichments</p> <p>Monitor small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place developed through PLC/ERPL.</p> <p>Finalize schedules to include ESE and ESOL needs with support.</p>
	Assistant Principal	<p>Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback</p> <p>Quarterly Data Chat meetings to review, discuss and plan for interventions and enrichments</p> <p>Monitor interventions/enrichments developed through PLC/ERPL.</p> <p>Upload Title 1</p>
Murray, Julie	Instructional Coach	<p>Facilitate PL; Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student data and groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment.</p> <p>Collaborative Planning with grade levels focused on SIP goal, content knowledge, and standards</p> <p>Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group and whole group instruction.</p> <p>Responsible for updating SIP information and uploading to the CIMS site.</p>
Haughwout, Katie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and, professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.</p>
Susid, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	<p>Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and, professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.</p>
Simon, Jerry	Teacher, ESE	<p>Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and, professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.</p>
Hall, Kiersten	Teacher, K-12	<p>Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and, professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.</p>
Simon, Diane	Teacher, K-12	<p>Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and,</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.
Pekala, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and, professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.
Hurst, Janet	Teacher, K-12	Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings, provide input on School Improvement Plan and, professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Shannon Young

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

710

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

8

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	125	121	105	133	115	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	690
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	25	26	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	3	3	2	2	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	33	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	42	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	14	21	17	18	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
	0	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	10	13	8	20	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/8/2022

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	121	124	110	140	105	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	21	26	17	17	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	18	3	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	4	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	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	121	124	110	140	105	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	21	26	17	17	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	18	3	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 0 4 12 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 13 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 18

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 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	54%	53%	56%				59%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						53%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						47%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	42%	50%				59%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						60%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						41%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	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	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
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	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
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	40	32	57	48	35				
ELL	34	42	35	33	51	47	35				
BLK	53	100		35	50						
HSP	42	48	41	44	55	47	43				
WHT	58	68	60	57	68	60	61				
FRL	47	58	54	46	60	50	49				

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	35	44	17	13	14	22				
ELL	32	42	46	29	30	9	29				
BLK	8			17							
HSP	41	45	47	37	34	15	27				
MUL	60										
WHT	66	45		60	54		77				
FRL	47	45	48	42	38	15	48				
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	31	38	27	50	46	14				
ELL	46	35		51	42						
BLK	45	57		42	55		36				
HSP	49	39	30	53	44	27	50				
MUL	38			31							
WHT	65	57	52	66	70	57	53				
FRL	53	49	44	52	52	37	40				

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	56
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	62
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	52
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?

Trends that are emerging across grade levels is an increase in Math Lowest Quartile by 38 percentage points. We increased in ELA Lowest Quartile by 10 percentage points. We increased our ELA and Math LG by 17 percentage points. We decreased by 1 percentage point in our science achievement and remained the same in ELA. Our SWD ELA achievement trend is in 2021 our ELA achievement was 26% with our learning gains at 38% and the lowest quartile at 44%. In 2022 our ELA achievement for SWD was 21% achievement with 45% learning gains and, 40 lowest quartile growth.

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

Our greatest need at this time is Science, ELA, and Math achievement. Our progress monitoring for Science was 62.6% and for State Assessment was 54%. This discrepancy indicates a need for instructional standards alignment. The 3rd grade Math district average in progress monitoring was 56.9% while George Marks had a 47%. The 4th grade Math district average in progress monitoring was 62% while George Marks had a 64.6%. The 5th grade Math district average in progress monitoring was 60.4% while George Marks had a 62.3%. The 3rd grade ELA district average in progress monitoring was 33.6% while George Marks had a 26.8%. The 4th grade ELA district average in progress monitoring was 29.1% while George Marks had a 28.2%. The 5th grade ELA district average in progress monitoring was 37.6% while George Marks had a 32.3%. Our SWD achievement went from 26% to 21% from the 21 school year to the 22 school year. This is a decrease of 5 percentage points.

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 would be the change in ELA standards and curriculum. Continuous quarantines due to Covid 19. Instructional supports were utilized for teacher shortages. A complete alignment now to BEST standards. Quarantining and teacher shortages have been minimized. We will be utilizing data spreadsheets, PLC time, ERPL times, and faculty meetings to disaggregate data to determine grade level needs of power standards for ELA and Math. For Science, we will be prearranging weekly hands-on experiments and planning the experiments out for each 9-week period.

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

Our lowest quartile for ELA and Math showed the greatest improvements. Our Math achievement went up from 50% to 53%. Our learning gains for math went from 45% to 62%. Our lowest quartile went from 14% to 52%.

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

The contributing factors were utilization of Title I funding for intervention staff in ELA and Math, maximizing master schedule to ensure small group instruction was implemented with fidelity and utilization of tutoring before/during/after school specifically aligned to students identified as tier 2 and 3. Using grade-level power standards with cohesive planning and coaching with specific emphasis on ELA and Math intervention.

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

Strategies that will be implemented will be walking to intervention (K-3) to maximize differentiated learning, and focus on power standards identified by grade level needs in ELA, Math, and Science. We are also doing schoolwide PBIS implementation.

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 be utilizing faculty meetings, PLC time, and ERPLs to ensure the standards are identified by disaggregating the lowest standards per grade level, per subject area, and a plan is made per grade level and subject. We will also utilize an EXCEL grade level spreadsheet to monitor individual and grade levels in correlation with data chats to ensure students are meeting benchmark standards.

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

Grade levels will look at grade level data and develop "power standards" to focus on during intervention time. The grade level will plan out that intervention block based on those standards for each subject area. The plans will be everchanging as the students master the skills. The plan will be turned in on a regular basis, and time will be given to make the plans.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards

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

Based on 2022 FSA Math data, achievement levels went up 3 percentage points. However, we have decreased by 4 percentage points within the past 5 years.
 Based on FSA ELA data our achievement level did not improve from the previous years.

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

We want to increase our Math achievement level from 53 percent to 62 percent. We want to increase our ELA achievement from 54 percent to 62 percent as well. All instructional staff will be engaged in PLC to implement curriculum standards. We will be doing data analysis to make sure instruction is occurring.

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

We will be using multiple ways of monitoring including quarterly data chats, weekly PLC, grade level Excel data sheets, and ongoing data analysis of assessments. We will be completing walk-throughs to ensure teachers are implementing their intervention plan (that they submitted) to fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Our evidence-based strategy is a response to intervention. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will review and disseminate assessments to determine what standards are needed to be re-taught to fidelity.

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

Response to intervention has an effect size of 1.07 (Hattie, 2009). The average effect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 1.07, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when the response to intervention is implemented with fidelity. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on student's learning and determining next steps.

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.

Share data with faculty that determined SIP goals and the need for response to intervention. The change in practice will be the close monitoring of standards, and implementation of correct interventions to support the gaps in learning. The interventions will be chosen after assessments are given.

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Disaggregate data to determine math and ELA power components (this will take place during faculty meetings, PLC, Coaching Cycles, and in ERPLS with each grade level including math and ELA intervention teachers, ESE teachers, and classroom teachers).

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Tutoring outside the school day. This will include before school, after students finish lunch, and after school.

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly data chats with teachers (classroom, ESE, ESOL, and intervention), administration, and coach.

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Grade level data EXCEL sheet that will include all assessments and student performance levels.

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Math Night at Publix and Literacy Night at the school.

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#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.

Based on the science data from the FSSA, our students achieved 54% proficiency. Over the last 5 years science proficiency has steadily dropped by 5 percentage points.

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

We want to increase our science achievement from 54 percent to 62 percent. We will work together through ERPLS, PLCs, Coaching Cycles, and data chats to improve proficiency across all grade levels by using assessment data to determine grade level needs. We will also have planned weekly common experiments prepared to ensure fidelity across grade levels for hands-on activities.

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

We will be using multiple ways of monitoring including quarterly data chats, weekly PLC, grade level Excel data sheets, and ongoing data analyzing of assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

The strategy we will implement will be to use hands investigations weekly and to use the 5E planning method when appropriate. Another strategy will be to introduce more interactive research-based games.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The rationale is that we had a 5 percent decrease in our science achievement level on the State Science assessment over the past 5 years. The district curriculum maps include ways to implement the 5E for science investigations and planning.

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.

We will have STEAM focusing on grade-level Science standards. STEAm will work with grade levels to determine through data-specific standards misconceptions.

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Each grade level team will be creating a plan to implement at least one hands-on investigation per week. We will have ERPLS, PLCs, Coaching Cycles, and data chats.

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Analyze assessments to determine focus standards.

Person Responsible SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring and discussing science data through the grade level EXCEL spread sheets during data chats and PLC time.

Person Responsible Julie Murray (jdmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Science Night

Person Responsible Danielle Susid (dmsusid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS

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

Our 2021-2022 data shows 374 total referrals. Out of the 374 referrals, 84 were school rule violations, 75 hitting and striking, and 74 immediate disruptions.

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

Our measurable goal will be that school rule violations will decrease by 20% by utilizing the PBIS program schoolwide. All staff was trained on how to use and implement PBIS using BARK.

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

We will monitor it by using the PBIS survey results, and REA discipline data. We are now implementing the BARK warning systems to help eliminate the number of overall referrals. We are also focused on positive reinforcement with rewards and student spotlights.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Adkins (cadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

PBIS

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

We are fully implementing PBIS schoolwide since PBIS is an evidence-based 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.

We will be presenting and training the faculty and all staff members at pre-planning with the expectations and the why. The system is BARK, and there is expected behavior for every area in the school. Instead of discipline referrals, the teachers will be using BARK violations to reach out to the home first using the PBIS flow chart. We will also have a schoolwide positive reward system where students will be recognized for consistently following school expectations. We will be monitoring data quarterly to see where we need to adjust or make improvements with our new implementation.

Person Responsible Colleen Adkins (cadkins@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

The instructional practices that will be implemented will be a walk-to intervention based on the beginning of the year data assessments, intervention lowest standards planning, data discussions to monitor and adjust, and intervention teachers working with all grade levels.

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

The instructional practices that will be implemented will be a walk-to intervention based on the beginning of the year data assessments for grade 3, intervention lowest standards planning, data discussions to monitor and adjust, and intervention teachers working with all grade levels.

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)

The measurable outcomes will be our achievement levels on the CSPM assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The measurable outcomes will be our achievement levels on the CSPM assessments and for 5th grade an achievement level of at least 62% on the FSSA (Science).

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 be monitoring by doing weekly walk-throughs, data spreadsheets for every grade level, quarterly data chats, coaching, and multiple implementation and planning scheduled times.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

YOUNG, SHANNON, sbyoung@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?

We will be using the BEST standards, SIPPS, and all district-approved interventions and curriculum.

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 rationale for using the above evidence-based materials and resources is district expectation.

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
Data spreadsheets to monitor timely inputting and data chats.	YOUNG, SHANNON, sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us
Intervention teachers working with tier students based on student need.	YOUNG, SHANNON, sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us
Coaching new teachers and any teacher that requests assistance.	Murray, Julie, jdmurray@volusia.k12.fl.us
PL time to assess data and create specific interventions for student need.	YOUNG, SHANNON, sbyoung@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.

George Marks Elementary will hold Parent Involvement Nights including Literacy Night, Light up GME, Hispanic Heritage Science Night, Publix Math Night and participate in community events such as the Rotary Christmas parade and Mardi Gras Dog parade. These events will include the Leadership Team, teachers from other Volusia County Schools, and PTA. We also host Meet the Teacher day, Open House night and Title 1 Parent Meetings. PTA will also be involved with school based activities. We will also be implementing schoolwide PBIS. We have embedded Social and Emotional Learning into our schedule to build classroom community.

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

The stakeholders include teachers, parents, students, leadership team, and the community. Teachers will be implementing PBIS, and participating in school based activities. Parents will be participating in school events, PTA, SAC and Title I meetings. Students will be following PBIS expectations, participating in school events, and community events. Leadership team will be participating in school events, community events, and the implementation of PBIS. The communities involvement contributes to Publix math nights, spirit nights, parades and business partners.