

Volusia County Schools

# Sugar Mill Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

## Demographics

Principal: Carol Sullo

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (54%)<br>2018-19: B (60%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 30%  |

### School Grades History

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

With the cooperation of home, school, and community, the Sugar Mill family will provide a warm, caring atmosphere where all children will be challenged to succeed.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Panthers Always Will Succeed

### 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 |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Figueroa, Laura   | Principal              |                                 |
| Cerda, Amanda     | Teacher, K-12          |                                 |
| Whitson, Lianne   | Teacher, K-12          |                                 |
| Cutting, Nicole   | Teacher, K-12          |                                 |
| Ramos, Stephanie  | Teacher, K-12          |                                 |
| Bennett, Audra    | Teacher, K-12          |                                 |
| Flaherty, Sherry  | Teacher, K-12          |                                 |
| Foster, Dawn      | Instructional Media    |                                 |
| Hawver, Deborah   | Teacher, ESE           |                                 |
| Boggs, Dawn-Marie | Administrative Support |                                 |
| Kent, Troy        | Assistant Principal    |                                 |
| Snodgrass, Traci  | Instructional Coach    |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/9/2021, Carol Sullo

**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**

55

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

622

**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.**

5

**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                              | 88          | 95 | 98 | 95 | 84 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 549   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 16          | 18 | 27 | 21 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 4  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

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 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| 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**

Tuesday 8/23/2022



**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                              | 95          | 85 | 93 | 94 | 94 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 559   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3           | 6  | 12 | 4  | 7  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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 | 2 | 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                              | 95          | 85 | 93 | 94 | 94 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 559   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3           | 6  | 12 | 4  | 7  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |

#### 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

#### 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 | 2 | 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             | 60%    | 53%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 61%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 64%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 46%    |          |       |        |          |       | 57%    | 46%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 59%    | 42%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 61%    | 59%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 56%    |          |       |        |          |       | 67%    | 56%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 43%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 59%    | 55%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 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 | 64%    | 58%      | 6%                         | 58%   | 6%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 62%    | 54%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                         | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -62%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 57%    | 60%      | -3%                        | 62%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 71%    | 59%      | 12%                        | 64%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -57%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                         | 60%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -71%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 56%      | -1%                        | 53%   | 2%                      |
| 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                                       | 22       | 44     | 36          | 23        | 34      | 24           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 47     | 45          | 35        | 61      | 45           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 56     |             | 36        | 29      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 53       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 65     | 45          | 67        | 59      | 36           | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 59     | 46          | 52        | 53      | 34           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 20       | 36     | 46          | 25        | 21      | 23           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 22       | 55     |             | 13        | 17      |              | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 69       |        |             | 65        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 61     |             | 66        | 51      |              | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 51     | 44          | 54        | 47      | 19           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 22       | 38     | 46          | 28        | 54      | 50           | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 43       |        |             | 43        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 30       | 43     | 30          | 27        | 38      | 36           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 50       | 60     |             | 50        | 55      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 70       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 66     | 66          | 66        | 71      | 66           | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 59     | 51          | 55        | 59      | 45           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 54   |
| 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 |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 376  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 30  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 1   |
| 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                                | 42  |
| 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  | 42  |
| 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   | 57  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| 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   | 58 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Some trends that emerged in our ESSA subgroups were that our students with disability proficiency dropped from the previous year, and is still below 42%. Our Black/African American students (42) did improve from the previous year. This is looking at ELA and Math proficiency. Overall there was improvement in all areas, but our ELA proficiency dropped by 1% and Math proficiency dropped by 2%. Science proficiency all saw a drop of 2%.

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

The data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are our proficiency for ESE subgroups. ESE students dropped 1% from the prior year but our African American students improved from 28% to 32% overall.

#### 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 was the lack of Tier I instruction in our intermediate separate class. The new actions that have been taken to address this need for improvement would be to focus on the Tier I instruction and intervention provided to those lowest quartile students in ELA. A new teacher for the intermediate separate class that ensures quality Tier 1 instruction.

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

The data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement were the learning gains and the lowest quartile gains. (Math LQ was +17)

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were intervention, as well as, consistent implementation of small group instruction. These were new actions that we made sure to progress monitor more this past school year.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are:

- \*Keep going back to Tier I instruction
- \*Focus on whole group instruction
- \*Lesson planning that is data driven
- \*Continue small group instruction and intervention
- \*Having PLCs weekly
- \* Adding PENDA to our 3 - 5 classrooms

**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.**

Professional Development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders:

- \*August 31, 2022- ESE Specific Topic for ESE Teachers, ESE Accommodations for non-ESE Teachers
- \*ESE ERPLs-to be scheduled
- \*Math Department PLCs-to be scheduled
- \*ELA Department PLCs-to be scheduled
- \* Science Department PLC to implement PENDA
- \*MTSS ERPLs- 8/23/22, 11/2/22, 1/11/23, and 2/22/23

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond are as follows:

- \*Math Coach that can support the new math curriculum
- \*Quarterly Data Tracking sheets for each teacher in K-5
- \*Weekly PLCs
- \*District support of our ESE Resource Teachers
- \* PENDA for 3rd - 5th grade classrooms.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

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

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

Based on our school data our students with disabilities are still 12% points below the 42% mark for ESSA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We would like to improve our students with disabilities proficiency to 30% in each area of ELA and Math. The lowest quartile students need to improve the Math learning gains to 30%. We would want to see Science improve to 40%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Using quarterly data sheets during PLC student district assessment data will be analyzed to identify needs for intervention and how to ensure improved understanding of the standards. We will identify students for intervention through data analysis,

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Laura Figueroa (lfigueroa@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Small group instruction with the classroom teacher.  
Intervention groups with the Coaches.  
PENDA Intervention program for Science in grades 3rd - 5th.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Teachers can meet students instructional level during small group instruction while still exposing students to grade level standards and expectations during Tier 1 instruction.

**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.

PLC - weekly data driven meeting to discuss student data and monitor district assessment data. Using this data to determine student progression and create intervention plans.

**Person Responsible**

Laura Figueroa (lfigueroa@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Intervention - daily intervention built into the master schedule for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to receive small group support.

**Person Responsible**

Troy Kent (takent@volusia.k12.fl.us)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

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

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessments and analysis, it revealed our overall proficiency dropped by 1 or 2 points but our learning gains and lowest quartile percentages improved in all areas. This led us to believe we need to strengthen our Tier 1 instruction.

**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 proficiency by 5% in each area. Our ELA will improve to 65% and our Math will improve to 64% and our Science will improve to 64%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity checks of the interventions that were selected to ensure the integrity of implementation (what percentage of our students is increasing?). Two times per month PLCs will engage in data analysis of LQ and ESSA subgroups students to determine the effect of the intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC. The instrument for data collection will be the quarterly data sheets provided to each teacher.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Laura Figueroa (lfigueroa@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports.

Decision trees will be used to identify students for intervention in ELA and Math and the appropriate intervention supports will be provided using the Benchmark and Big Idea Intervention curriculums.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The use of data analysis will ensure all students are monitored and supports are provided adequately based on the students needs.

**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.

PLC#1 - Review students in intervention from the previous year and set up intervention group based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those interventions.

**Person Responsible** Traci Snodgrass (tmsnodgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Intervention - Provide baseline assessments to identified students and begin to create groups and provide intervention supports. Use progress monitoring to identify an action plan for identified students.  
PENDA 3rd - 5th to improve overall science proficiency.

**Person Responsible** Troy Kent (takent@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.**

Sugar Mill Elementary works diligently to build a culture conducive to a productive learning environment and positive relationships. Our school sponsors meeting such as PTA and Sac, allow our parents the opportunity to help with the decision-making of the school's operations. PTA was available to provide parents information regarding parent involvement opportunities and membership They provide many family involvement activities throughout the year such a s Trunk or Treating and the Color Run. The school also provides a Parent Handbook regarding procedures and policies. Sugar Mill's events such as Open House, Literacy Night, Math Night, Science Night, and PTK Workshop are developed to provide our parents knowledge and support throughout the school year. For example, Open House allows parents to meet teachers, learn about curriculum and classroom expectations for each teacher. Our Literacy, Math, and Science Nights help help provide the parent knowledge and support to assist their child at home with academics. Sugar Mill utilizes many forms of communication with the parents. To help provide parents information concerning the school-wide events and student activities, the school communicates via Connect Ed messages, in-school conferences student planners, school marquee, school newsletters, parent flyers, Facebook Twitter, and the school website. These various ways are how Sugar Elementary ensures our parents are included in building a positive environment and culture for the school.

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

The school has a coordinator to help establish and maintain community partnerships. The school builds ad sustains partnerships with the local community through actively participating in community events. The principal and administration along with the School Improvement Team has established a partnership with local businesses to share information about school programs and accomplishments. Our local elected

officials and police officers participate in school and community events. Throughout the year, students are engaged in various school and community activities. Students are provided the opportunity and encouraged to implement their new learning experiences in their daily routines. Sugar Mill Elementary School build and sustains partnerships with the local community by holding the following events: Meet the Teacher- info form various extended day providers will share information via social media, school website, and weekly communication from administration. Open House-PTA will promote membership among parents, grandparents, business partners and community members. Business Partners will share information via social media, the school website, and weekly communication from administration. Volunteer/Business Partner Appreciation Breakfast- SME offers a breakfast to thank all business partners, and community members who support our school through out the year if CDC guidelines allow. Family Curriculum Nights and other PTA school wide events occur and business partners are invited to share information as well. These events are attended by all stakeholders in the school community including the administration, staff, and their families.