

Volusia County Schools

# Louise S. Mcinnis 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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Widalis Camacho**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (54%)
<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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/mcinnis/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	62%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

McInnis staff, students, and community work together to encourage life-long learning in order to achieve our goals.

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

McInnis Elementary ensures academic excellence by motivating students through diverse learning experiences and celebrating individual successes.

### 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
Struska, Paul	Principal	
Cortes, Catherine	Assistant Principal	
Gaeta, Mari	Teacher, ESE	
Montalvo, Sara	School Counselor	
Cruces, Lilia	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Dail, Elba	Teacher, K-12	
Del Moral, Leida	Teacher, K-12	
Albright, Marci	Teacher, K-12	
Miesmer, Jessica	Teacher, PreK	
Scibilia, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Felix, Jasmine	Teacher, K-12	
Barnes, Nicholas	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Widalis Camacho

**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**

39

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

375

**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.**

11

**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	58	65	44	69	63	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	377
Attendance below 90 percent	14	24	7	15	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	14	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	6	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/22/2022

**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	59	39	63	58	73	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	1	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

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

**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	59	39	63	58	73	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	1	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

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

## 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	39%	53%	56%				40%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						60%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						52%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	42%	50%				51%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						49%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						32%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	55%	59%				38%	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	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

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	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	56%	-18%	53%	-15%
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	13	50	64	20	47	50	32				
ELL	19	48	54	31	44	52	32				
HSP	26	50	52	37	45	55	45				
WHT	54	63		58	57	33	67				
FRL	36	53	57	46	51	48	53				
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	6	28		17	56		36				
ELL	16	31		37	59		34				
HSP	26	41		45	66		43				
WHT	49	56		58	63		41				
FRL	31	44	27	47	63	33	40				
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	2	39	55	22	37	32	5				
ELL	36	62	55	46	54	35	33				
HSP	39	60	52	50	49	30	38				
WHT	45	67		57	56		45				
FRL	37	58	48	48	49	33	39				

### 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38

Students With Disabilities	
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	55
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	48
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?

Across grade levels, ELA is our lowest performing content area (39% proficiency). Our ELL (19%) and SWD (13%) subgroups are the lowest performing in ELA.

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

When analyzing student cohort groups for FSA and progress monitoring data, the current 5th graders (raw data for cohort comparison = -51%) showed the greatest drops in proficiency in ELA, specifically ELL and SWD subgroups.

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

COVID-19 slide; lack of fidelity with ELA programs as evidenced by classroom visits and walk-throughs; learning a new ELA curriculum and standards

professional learning; ongoing data analysis through PLC meetings and data chats; targeted student support

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

ELA lowest quartile learning gains increased 27% (from 33 to 60)  
science proficiency increased 13% (from 43 to 56)

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

science--strong 5th-grade team; supported by school- and District leadership;  
ELA--strong support facilitation team; tutoring, interventions

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

target-task alignment; reciprocal teaching; multiple exposures to vocabulary; repeated readings

**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.**

ERPL with District support; school-based learning walks

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

continued support of school-based and District leadership

### **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.**

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 Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that only 13% of our SWDs and 19% of our ELLs reached proficiency in ELA. Further analysis showed that most of these students are also in both subgroups.

**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 SWDs and ELLs in ELA proficiency from 16 (average of the two)-20%. We will utilize District unit assessments in ELA to progress monitor ESSA subgroups.

**Monitoring:**

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

PLCs will engage in data analysis of ESSA subgroup students to determine progress toward proficiency. Instruction, curriculum, and environment will all be assessed. Data will be collected using administrative classroom visits.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

repeated readings, reciprocal teaching, multiple exposures to vocabulary

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

John Hattie's effect sizes--reciprocal teaching is .74; repeated readings is .75; vocabulary programs .62

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. PLC data discussions
2. Administrative Classroom Visits
3. Professional Learning (through ERPL)
4. Coaching cycles
5. Collaborative planning

**Person Responsible**

Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. 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.

Our area of focus is aligned to District Strategic Goal 1 which is to engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it revealed that only 39% of our students show proficiency in ELA.

**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 students reaching proficiency in ELA from 39% to 42%,

**Monitoring:**

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

PLCs will engage in data analysis to determine the progress toward reaching this goal. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed through administrative classroom visits.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Paul Struska (ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

ensure daily target-task alignment throughout all grade levels

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

teacher clarity--Hattie effect size .75

**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.

1. PLC discussion of grade-level content
2. professional learning related to ELA grade-level expectations
3. administrative classroom visits to monitor implementation
4. quarterly, school-based learning walks (for classroom teachers)
5. coaching cycles
6. collaborative planning

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

**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

In our primary grades students took the i-Ready diagnostic assessment 3 times throughout the 21-22 school year. The final data from Diagnostic 3 was as follows:

Kindergarten - 0% of students were Tier 3, 23% of students were Tier 2, while 77% were Tier 1; High Frequency Words (33%) is the greatest area of need.

First Grade - 5% Tier 3, 38% Tier 2, and 56% were Tier 1; informational test comprehension showed 54% placed within the Tier 2 or Tier 3, the greatest area of need, in the final diagnostic.

Second Grade - 13% Tier 3, 50% Tier 2, 37% Tier 1 overall placement. Comprehension in literary text is a concern as more than 65% of students assessed fell within the Tier 2/Tier 3 placement on the final diagnostic.

Grade level data points analyzed found that 2nd grade Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA will be an area of focus during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 39% which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and ELL which performed at 13% and 16% respectively.

FSA Data

3rd grade percent proficient: 39%

4th grade percent proficient: 35%

5th grade percent proficient: 45%

As a result of student performance below both the district and state averages it was determined that Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA to be an Area of Focus during the 2022-2023 school year.

**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)**

Grades K-2 ELA student proficiency will increase overall during the 2022-2023 school year. The newly implemented progress monitoring (F.A.S.T.) assessment data will show an increase in student proficiency from Assessment 1 to Assessment 3. 55% or higher of students in first and second grade will be proficient by assessment 3 of the FAST.

The goal is for each of the three grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency during the 2022-2023 school year.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Grades 3-5 ELA student proficiency will increase overall from 39% to 54%. Individual grade levels will increase overall student proficiency:

3rd grade from 39% to 54%

4th grade from 35% to 54%

5th grade from 45% to 54%

The goal is for each of the three grade levels to demonstrate a significant increase in student proficiency during the 2022-2023 school year with 54% or more students performing at proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom visits using a walkthrough tool with specific look-fors and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom visits and student performance data. Feedback will be given upon classroom visits to include, but not limited to the use of learning targets, success criteria, student activity versus teacher activity, etc.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Struska, Paul, ptstrusk@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?

1) repeated readings, reciprocal teaching, multiple exposures to vocabulary

2) ensure daily target-task alignment throughout all grade levels

**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?

1) John Hattie's effect sizes--reciprocal teaching is .74; repeated readings is .75; vocabulary programs .62

2) teacher clarity--Hattie effect size .75

**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
<p>Literacy Leadership- benchmark-aligned instruction will be used to promote a culture of literacy and will be monitored to ensure all students are exposed to grade level tasks.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching- Academic Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on understanding newly implemented benchmarks. The ELA Coach will provide support with delivery of instruction, lesson modeling, and planning in PLC meetings.</p> <p>Assessment—Time in PLC meetings will help teachers assess their understanding of benchmarks and reflect on benchmark aligned instruction and student performance.</p> <p>Professional Learning- Teachers will continue to engage in Professional Learning to deepen their understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and practices designed to enhance student mastery of the content/concepts taught.</p>	<p>Struska, Paul, ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership - Data Analysis: monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLC meetings. Academic Coach, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and 3 students through progress monitoring and data chats will occur and instructional decisions made to increase student achievement.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching- ELA Coach will provide coaching and support to teachers focused on identifying leveled groups based on benchmarks not mastered. In addition, the Intervention teacher and classroom teachers will work with Tier 2 &amp; 3 students to remediate areas of focus.</p> <p>Assessment- Unit Assessments will be administered according to the District assessment schedule. Assessment results will be progress monitored by administration and teacher teams.</p> <p>Professional Learning- Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during ERPLs on the MTSS process to learn structures and strategies to improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction and student achievement.</p>	<p>Struska, Paul, ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership- Calibration Walks/Learning Walks will help ensure benchmark and tasks alignment. Calibration Walks/Learning Walks will promote a culture of literacy for both teachers and students. Feedback about frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks will be shared with teachers.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching- School Leadership/District Specialists will provide coaching and feedback to teachers focused on school-wide lookfors: frequency, benchmark alignment, questioning, and tasks. Teachers will engage in Coaching Cycles and feedback will be provided by the ELA Coach as well.</p> <p>Assessment- District Assessments will be administered after each unit. Assessment results will be progress monitored by administration and teachers during PLCs.</p> <p>Professional Learning- Teachers will engage in Professional Learning during PLCs, ERPLs and faculty meeting focused on Differentiated Instruction, SWDs, ELLs, and how to strategically group students based on skills/benchmarks not mastered.</p>	<p>Struska, Paul, ptstrusk@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>

## 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.

PBIS--implement school-wide common area expectations and attention signal

school counselor--school-wide SEL lessons; word of the week; small-group lessons with Mental Health team therapist--anxiety, emotion regulation, social skills; minute meetings  
individual student conferences/goal setting (believing in your students)  
check-in with students everyday and checkouts

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

School Counselor--oversees social-emotional well being of students, staff, and community  
PBIS Team--create school-wide expectations and attention signal  
classroom teachers--hold individual conferences with students to set goals