

Volusia County Schools

Spruce Creek 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2016

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)	91%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spruce Creek Elementary School

642 TAYLOR RD, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">91%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">32%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Bobcats strive to EXCEL as a diverse community of critical thinkers, problem solvers and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

School Belief Statements

We believe education is the shared responsibility of family, students, staff, and community.

We believe all members of our school family should be treated with dignity and respect.

We believe positive communication among students, parents, teachers, and staff is the key to a successful school.

We believe learning is a dynamic lifelong process.

We believe all individuals have a right to a safe and secure environment where trust, caring, encouragement, and support prevail.

We believe in the celebration of our success.

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
Hall, Andrea	Principal	
Richardson, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Campbell, Monica	Instructional Coach	
Nunez, Daniela	Teacher, K-12	
Jandrew, Madison	Teacher, K-12	
Fabulich, Samantha	Other	
Emers, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
Weinrich, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Shirley	Teacher, K-12	
White, Kim	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 12/16/2016, Andrea Hall

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

721

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

5

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

9

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	117	108	125	126	109	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	32	25	18	3	5	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	3	5	6	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	15	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	3	1	0	0	0	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 7/30/2022

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	109	111	134	132	109	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	77	30	23	25	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	2	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	1	3	0	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	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	109	111	134	132	109	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	77	30	23	25	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	2	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	1	3	0	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	

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	61%	53%	56%				67%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						61%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						50%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	71%	42%	50%				70%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						66%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						46%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	55%	59%				62%	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	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	28	44	30	39	58	56	28				
ELL	45	52		64	62		58				
ASN	85			100							
BLK	39	65		43	71		64				
HSP	52	52	50	64	60		43				
MUL	46			75							
WHT	64	55	44	73	68	56	70				
FRL	56	60	50	64	66	66	57				
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	35	38	32	39	41	22	31				
ELL	67			67							
ASN	100			100							
BLK	58			63							
HSP	59	55		50	55		58				
MUL	50			57							
WHT	67	61	38	69	61	21	66				
FRL	57	54	32	61	57	30	53				
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	31	54	43	32	41	40	23				
ELL	55	57		58	73						
ASN	85	77		89	77						
BLK	48	50		65	64						
HSP	47	54		53	56	50					
MUL	85			58							
WHT	69	60	47	72	68	48	63				
FRL	58	60	53	63	64	48	50				

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	63
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	60
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	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	55
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	62
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?

ELA achievement in all students trending down. ELA achievement in the 2020-2021 school year was 66% and decreased to 61% in the 2021-2022 school year. Math achievement in the 2020-2021 school year at 67% and increased to 71% in the 2021-2022 school year. SWD subgroup had a decrease in ELA achievement from 35% in 2020-2021 to 28% in 2021-2022, as well as a decrease in Science achievement from 31% in 2020-2021 to 28% in 2021-2022. Math achievement in SWD subgroup from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 school year remained the same at 39%. African American subgroup ELA achievement in 2020-2021 school year was 58% decreased to 39% in the 2021-2022 school year, Math achievement in 2020-2021 school year was 63% decreased to 43% in the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Based on progress monitoring data, the SWD subgroup ELA achievement showed the greatest need for improvement.

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

Students with disabilities have large learning gaps. Many self-contained ESE classrooms have multiple grade levels of students.

The actions we will be taking to these factors are Title I funding, intervention teachers for every grade level, tutoring all grade levels, school-wide starting earlier (October), and new teachers mentoring with colleagues and academic coach.

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

In 2020-2021, Math LQ LG increased proficiency from 35% to 59% in 2021-2022 school year.

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

For increased proficiency in Math there was after school tutoring, support from the district Math department, and focusing on the B.E.S.T standards. The new action taken was after school tutoring starting in January, and Math LQ LG tracking, data chats specific to this subgroup, and LQ mentors from Faculty on campus. For increased proficiency in ELA, teachers utilized the i-Ready toolbox, teacher directed lessons, and targeted/dedicated time for small group, intervention, and enrichment. Students also tracked data and participated in student-led data chats.

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

Tutoring beginning in October instead of January, new Math curriculum, continue Math fluency program (Reflex and Frax), and MTSS professional development and 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.

MTSS, Learning Ally, PLC planning, Reciprocal Teaching, book studies on Mathematical Mindset and Hacking School Discipline professional developments will be given to all staff to support teachers and leaders.

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

Intervention teachers K-5, Stock Take training, weekly PLCs, and planning time with ERPLs throughout the year; additional school based Early Release PD focused on team PLC time, and June Planning PLC time for 27 hours average for grade level teams.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

In review of the 21-22 ELA state assessment proficiency, overall, ELA proficiency dropped from 66% to 61% and ELA LG dropped 64% to 56%.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

The goal is to increase the ELA proficiency measurable outcome from 56% to 66%. Teachers will provide daily small-group differentiated instruction and daily intervention in ELA. Coach will support student achievement in ELA by hosting frequent grade-level data reviews at PLCs.

Monitoring:

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

Use of formative/ diagnostic assessment data, learning walks, ongoing academic coach support, student-led conferences/data binders, continuous student progress monitoring three times a year, and weekly team PLCs. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA to monitor progress of our LQ and ESSA subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our evidence based strategy is standards-aligned direct instruction, student-led conferences and collaborative structures with student voice.

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

Classroom discussion has an effect size of 0.82 (Hattie, 2009). Classroom discussion allows students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learned the concepts that are being taught, provide remediation and enrichment as needed. Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.60 (Hattie, 2009). Hattie points to research that says direct instruction involves seven steps: clear learning intentions; success criteria of performance; engagement of students' attention and interest; presentation of lesson using input, modeling, and CFUs; guided practice; closure to review and clarify; and independent practice to reinforce the skill or content in a real-life or different but relevant context.

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.

Teachers will be trained in ELA standards that include standards aligned learning targets for implementation, including reciprocal teaching.

Person Responsible Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

A literacy team has been created and will meet on a regular basis to review student data and plan for future instruction.

Person Responsible Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty, staff, and stakeholders/community members, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for collaborative structures and classroom discussion.

Person Responsible Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning during PLCs to differentiate instruction based on data analysis.

Ongoing support from academic coach and opportunity for coaching cycles to assist with student-led conferences and collaborative structures support.

Person Responsible Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

In review of the 21-22 ELA state assessment proficiency, overall, LQ ELA achievement decreased from 35% - 28% (Federal guideline of 41% or higher). Students with disabilities have large learning gaps. Many self-contained ESE classrooms have multiple grade levels of students.

BPIE priority indicators identified:
 #2- The school has developed and regularly monitors progress for goals related to short and long term improvement efforts to implement and improve inclusive education practices as measures by the BPIE.
 #18- Specials, electives, and Tech Ed teachers have regular opportunities to consult with ESE teachers.
 #32- Reports of progress toward implementing inclusion are disseminated to families, district personnel, and community members.

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

The goal is to increase ELA LQ proficiency from 28% to 41%. Teachers will provide daily small-group differentiated instruction and daily intervention in ELA. Coach will support student achievement in ELA by hosting frequent grade-level data reviews at PLCs.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom walk-throughs, data chats with teacher, admin and academic coach, collaborative discussions amongst general ed/ ESE/ intervention teachers, teacher-led interventions, and coaching cycles. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA to monitor progress of our LQ and ESSA subgroups. Coaching logs used during walk-throughs will provide feedback to teachers at PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Our evidence based strategy is interventions for students with learning needs, student-led conferences and collaborative structures with student voice.

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

Interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of 0.77 (Hattie, 2009). Hattie explains that to improve achievement teachers must provide students with tools and strategies to organize themselves as well as new material; techniques to use while reading, writing, and doing math; and systematic steps to follow when working through a learning task or reflecting upon their own learning.
 Classroom discussion has an effect size of 0.82 (Hattie, 2009). Classroom discussion allows students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learned the concepts that are being taught, provide remediation and enrichment as needed.

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.

Master schedule is designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

ESE and general education teachers will engage in collaborative planning during PLCs to differentiate instruction based on data analysis.

Ongoing support from academic coach and opportunity for coaching cycles to assist with differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff, and stakeholders/community members, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Learning Ally. Train staff members on the use of Learning Ally in the classroom.

Person Responsible Pamela Melton (pmelton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

In review of the 21-22 ELA state assessment proficiency, overall, ELA proficiency dropped from 66% to 61% and ELA LG dropped 64% to 56%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to increase the ELA proficiency measurable outcome from 56% to 62%. Teachers will provide daily small-group differentiated instruction and daily intervention in ELA. Coach will support student achievement in ELA by hosting frequent grade-level data reviews at PLCs.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the use of formative assessment data, AVID learning walks, ongoing academic coach support, student-led conferences/AVID binders, and weekly team PLCs. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA to monitor progress of our LQ and ESSA subgroups. An AVID learning walk observation form will be used as a tool during learning walks. This tool addresses expectations, things to look for, and observation notes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Hall (amhall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

AVID and collaborative structures

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

AVID helps develop reading, writing, critical thinking, team work organization and reading skills as well as deep content knowledge. AVID does this by encouraging teachers and students to work together in a way that is positive, collaborative, and impactful making them successful and college and career ready.

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.

AVID learning walks, teachers visit classrooms with AVID strategies being implemented and they can take it back to their own classroom for implementation.

Person Responsible

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Sharing AVID strategies at PLCs

Person Responsible

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing AVID professional development and support from academic coach and opportunity for coaching cycles to assist with AVID strategies.

Person Responsible

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Training in collaborative structures

Person Responsible

Monica Campbell (mlcampbe@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.

The school addresses building positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by hosting events such as face-to-face Meet the Teacher and Open House. In past years, we hosted Fall Festival, Dads Take Your Child to School Day, the holiday show, a Veterans Day presentation, and staff nights. The school's Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Team also hosts mentors to work with Tier 2 students(at risk). The district is promoting a mentoring program called The League of Mentors, which is also continued to be implemented into our school this year.

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

The stakeholders include teachers, parents, community members, administration, school counselors, business partners and staff. Teachers and staff support social and emotional learning by giving positive referrals to students, reinforcing PBIS rewards and incentives, implementing AVID strategies to promote career and college readiness. The two counselors provide social emotional learning by meeting with students and providing guidance lessons. The community members also support career and college readiness and mentor students on campus. Administration reinforces positive behavior with positive referrals for staff and students and there will be a Teacher and Staff of the Month program . Parents support a positive culture and environment by completing the School Culture Climate Survey, connecting with us on social media, joining PTA and volunteering on campus.