Turie T. Small Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Turie T. Small Elementary School

800 SOUTH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/turietsmall/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Joy Boyd Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/14/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (33%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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

Turie T. Small Elementary School

800 SOUTH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/turietsmall/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	90%

School Grades History

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

The Turie T. Small Elementary family will create an academic, safe, and respectful environment to ensure our children will learn and reach their full potential to compete in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

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
McAndrew, Amber	Assistant Principal	Oversee implementation of plan Science Task Force Team Leader
Coates, Jennifer	Other	Oversee Academic Interventions
Folkerts, Courtney	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Facilitation
Boyd-Walker, Joy	Principal	Oversee all areas of SIP Oversee all Task Forces
Milton, Yoder	Instructional Coach	Coach new teachers and teachers in need of additional supports Support with Interventions
Weiss, Trae	Other	Assist with administrative roles including discipline and safety and security

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/14/2022, Joy Boyd Walker

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.*
2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

385

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

11

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	71	70	70	79	88	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	35	33	33	37	35	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	16	16	6	14	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	41	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	45	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	19	19	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	15	21	13	32	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136

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	2	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	65	73	69	76	81	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	30	35	22	34	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	6	1	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	2	1	3	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	65	73	69	76	81	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	30	35	22	34	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	6	1	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	2	1	3	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	27%	53%	56%				44%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						60%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						55%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	42%	50%				56%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%						65%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						56%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	55%	59%				36%	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	43%	58%	-15%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	59%	8%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%
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	10	24	6	14	31	29	16				
ELL				9							
BLK	24	37	22	25	40	36	28				
HSP	15	36		22	38						
MUL	33			22							
WHT	52	44		56	53						
FRL	26	35	26	27	40	39	32				

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	14	23		19	31		17				
ELL											
BLK	24	34		29	28	50	29				
WHT	52			60							
FRL	27	38	36	33	30	42	28				

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	18	32	31	25	57	50	16				
BLK	41	59	55	55	66	57	33				
HSP	29	50		46	45						
MUL	50			58							
WHT	69	63		65	75						
FRL	45	61	55	57	65	56	37				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	28
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	51
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

In all core content areas, ELA, Math and Science, scores decreased. Achievement and Learning Gains decreased across all areas with percentage scores decreasing a minimum of 14 percentage points in Math Achievement of the Lowest Quartile to a 33% decrease in the overall Math Learning Gains. ELA scores decreased between 16 to 20 percentage points in all categories. Science Achievement increased from 30% to 34%.

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

All core content areas are in need of improvement. ELA, Math and Science Achievement will all need to be addressed. When analyzing the subgroup data, our Students with Disabilities, Black Students and Students Receiving Free and Reduced Lunch will also need to be addressed with additional supports to increase their achievement levels.

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

When walking through classrooms, walk through trend data showed a lack of explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the standards. Teacher met collaboratively during their Plus One time, but implementation of aligned instruction was not consistent across all grade levels.
In order to address these factors, multiple supports will be put into place. New teachers and teachers identified as needing support will undergo coaching cycles. They will begin working with our academic coach on core instructional practices. Teachers will work in collaborative planning groups during the extended time (Plus One) and this time will be monitored by administration on a daily basis. Feedback will be provided and district support personnel will be utilized to strengthen teacher plans and instruction.

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

No areas showed a percentage of growth but overall Science achievement decreased by 6% which was the least significant decrease in scores. Also, our White students 5 percentage points in Math Achievement which was proportionately lower than other subgroups.

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

Our school has strong district supports in Science. We were able to pull small groups and remediate skills based on past year's science data as well as this year's SMT Science test. This allowed teachers and support staff to address the skills in need of remediation as well as the chance to continue strong instruction in classrooms daily.

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

Analyzing our MTSS and Tiered supports will show which students are in need of acceleration. Utilizing walk to intervention and other supports will allow students showing mastery of skills to be accelerated.

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

The focus of Professional Development will be focused on delivering strong core instruction and small group instruction. By increasing the rigor and depth of our core instruction, all students will receive a strong foundation of Benchmarks. Using the instructional time to walk the classroom, talk to students and analyze their work will allow teachers to determine who is need of additional support in small groups and who is ready for acceleration. The small group will allow the teacher the opportunity to close learning gaps and support students.

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

Frequent walk throughs by administration, district supports and state supports will ensure that strong instruction aligned to the benchmarks is taking place inside classrooms daily. Using district and school-based supports to deliver strong interventions will allow us to close the learning gaps and decrease the amount of students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Learning walk data indicated a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark. During walks, administration, district and state teams noted that standards were not being taught with fidelity. Planning sessions were occurring however implementation of aligned instruction was not consistent.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By December 2022, 90% of teachers will deliver benchmark aligned instruction to students as evidenced by walkthrough data. Student data will be monitored from the midyear FAST/ district assessments to monitor progress towards proficiency. Data should show an upward trend with a goal of a minimum of 25% proficient. The number of teachers that require instructional coaching will decrease by 75%, by April of 2023. By April of 2023, 90% of students will show proficiency of 50% or higher on benchmark-aligned instruction and common assessments in grades K-5.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Learning walks will be conducted weekly by district and admin team. Admin and team will create Look Fors to guide the walks and provide common language to ensure consistency of data collected. Lesson plans will be gathered weekly and feedback will be provided. During Plus One Collaborative Planning, administration, coach and district personnel will rotate and provide feedback. The plans will also be collected and additional targeted feedback will be provided. Student assessment data will be utilized to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher clarity- teachers have had received training/ information on the structure put in place for collaborative planning, learning walks, lesson plans and PLCCs. This ensures every teacher understands the expectations and has a clear vision for each structure.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: have appropriately high expectations. share their notions of success criteria with their students. ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to

used for selecting this strategy.	students; and provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Clear and explicit expectations for planning and instruction.

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Common planning to include district content specialists.

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly monitoring of data during PLCCs. Data will include learning walks and student assessment data.

Person Responsible	Yoder Milton (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Walk throughs by admin, coaches and staff .

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District PDs to review standards and benchmarks in curriculum.

Person Responsible	Yoder Milton (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a leadership team to drive school decisions and support core instruction at all grade levels.

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create task forces to address specific areas of focus based on school needs including ELA, Math, Science, SEL/PBIS and Community Outreach/ Business Partners.

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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 27% of our students scored proficient on the ELA FSA, 28% scored proficient on the Math FSA and 34% scored proficient on Science FSSA. All percentages were below the district and state averages. Further analysis showed that students in the following subgroups also did not meet proficiency and need additional academic supports: African American, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student outcome: Our goal will be to decrease the amount of students needing Tier 2 and 3 interventions by 20% including our ESSA subgroups. Teacher practice: We will utilize district assessments in ELA, Math, and Science to monitor progress. 100% of teachers in grades K-5 will deliver intensive small group instruction during intervention. Coaching practice: The Academic coach will utilize the Tier 2 and 3 spreadsheet to identify and monitor for an overall decrease in tier 2 and 3 students by 20%.
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 fidelity and integrity of implementation (What percentage of our students is increasing?). Two times per month PLCs will engage in data analysis of LQ and ESSA subgroup 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 SIPPS Mastery tests and Benchmark Weekly and Unit Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yoder Milton (yamilton@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 Multi-tiered System of Supports and includes: • K-2 will implement SIPPS which is a systematic foundational skills program. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during intervention time and through monitoring of Mastery test data. • 3-5 will implement through Benchmark Advance intervention resources. It will be monitored through weekly and Unit Benchmark assessments. • Data based decision making will be utilized to identify additional supports for our ESSA subgroups, determining the effectiveness of our intervention and need for professional learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS is not a "wait to fail" model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity. Source: Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005; Dexter,

specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Hughes, & Farmer, 2008; Simmons, Coyne, Kwok, McDonagh, Harn, & Kame'enui, 2008; Hattie, 2015

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 to review students in intervention from previous year and create intervention groups based on student data. Determine how to meet the needs of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students based on the Decision Rules and ICEL
(Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

Person Responsible	Yoder Milton (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS systems and structures.

Person Responsible	Yoder Milton (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Decision Rules guidance and ICEL strategy: Tier 1 -100% of students should receive Tier 1 and at least 65% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. Decrease the number of students receiving Tier 2 support by 50%. Decrease the number of students requiring Tier 3 support by 25%. All students will receive these supports including SWD.

Person Responsible	Yoder Milton (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLCs to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on Benchmark/ Unit Assessments in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible	Yoder Milton (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Biweekly checkpoints of targeted students- make adjustments to the intervention, as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Coates (jecoates@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide academic interventions to students in need of additional academic support.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Coates (jecoates@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of lowest quartile students through walkthroughs. Students that continue to need further supports/ intervention would be identified in order to move them to Tier 3.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Coates (jecoates@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS and SEL	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Student behaviors, such as physical aggression including hitting/ striking and verbal aggression including profane language, have increased according to school discipline data. Additionally, district data shows disproportionate discipline of minority students and students with disabilities are receiving out of school suspensions at a disproportionate rate to their peers.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	During the 2021-22 SY, TT Small had 599 referrals. The resultant consequence of the referrals led to students being suspended out of school for a total of 188 days . The teachers' goal is to work with the SEL TOA, Guidance and PBIS team to decrease the amount of discipline referrals being written by 25%. With the implementation of PBIS and the use of an SEL TOA, student referrals will decrease by 25%. In order to accomplish this, the academic coach and PBIS/SEL task force leader will increase positive behaviors by implementing PBIS strategies and decrease negative behaviors through daily practices including implementing the Bulldog BARK, Bulldog Bucks, and complimenting positive behaviors when noticed. We will seek our business partners for donations for incentives that recognize the hard work of faculty and students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Discipline data will be monitored monthly and a task force will be developed to closely monitor and support school-wide PBIS initiatives. During PLCs data will be shared to increase core instruction in behavior for all students and intensifying monitoring of disproportionate rates of discipline.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber McAndrew (admcandr@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented	Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS planning team and by the school based PBIS PLCs on a monthly basis.

for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making. Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). These assessments contains 53-items divided into ten critical elements that make up an effective PBIS Tier 1 system. Completion of the BoQ produces scale and subscale scores indicating the extent to which these critical elements are in place.

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.

Train teachers on PBIS

Person Responsible	Cherise Webb-Moore (cawebbmo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify mentors for students with high incidents

Person Responsible	Amber McAndrew (admcandr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide incident data to teachers monthly at faculty meetings

Person Responsible	Trae Weiss (tmweiss@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize strategies within the classroom to support PBIS

Person Responsible	Cherise Webb-Moore (cawebbmo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop clear expectations with students

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor student behaviors using EWS

Person Responsible	Trae Weiss (tmweiss@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency decreased in grade 3 to 26% from 29% in our primary grads. Based on analysis of ELA district assessment data, SIPPS Mastery tests, Unit assessments and i-Ready, students lacked essential grade level skills. Additionally, data from our school-level walkthroughs indicate a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to grade-level foundational skills.

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

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was 27%. Based on state data for students in 3rd grade: 26%, 4th grade: 23% and 5th grade: 30% of students are not on track to meeting the targeted proficiency level of 41% or higher. Additionally, walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

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)

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to increase growth on the progress monitoring assessment according to district ELA assessment data.
By January, 50% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned unit assessments.
By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.
By May, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to increase growth on the progress monitoring assessment according to district ELA assessment data.
By January, 50% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned unit assessments.
By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.
By May, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

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

We will monitor our area of focus through completed planning protocols, learning walks, data analysis at PLCs, and walkthrough data and feedback for continued growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boyd-Walker, Joy, jrboyd1@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. §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?

Evidence-based practices/programs being implemented are ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum aligned to the BEST Standards, Core Connections, SIPPS in K-3 to address foundational skills, daily small group differentiated instruction utilizing ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum to also include the intervention and enrichment toolkit. Additionally, collaborative planning with grade level teams utilizing a planning protocol and Test Item Specifications.

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?

We will use the district approved ELA resources and curriculum for core instruction as well as interventions. These address the identified need and have a record to effectiveness for our population per the district. We continuously collaborate with district and state resources to implement new strategies to support ELA instruction.

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
ELA Collaborative Planning with grade level teams to include support teachers, administration, academic coach, and regional resource teachers. Academic Coach and regional resource teacher in order to ensure that instruction and students tasks are aligned to the benchmark. District Transformation Resource Teachers and ELA task forces will facilitate Professional learning on the Collaborative Planning Protocol. Formative and summative assessment data will be considered during planning and monitored for fidelity purposes.	Boyd-Walker, Joy, jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us
Monitor ELA assessment data during weekly professional learning community collaborations, monthly School Leadership Team Meetings and weekly principal leadership collaborations. 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 will occur and instructional decisions made to increase student achievement.	Boyd-Walker, Joy, jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us
New and identified teachers will participate in ongoing tier 1 and tier 2 level coaching support in ELA with the academic coach. This support will include observations, feedback, modeling, lesson planning, assessment review, and as appropriate professional learning sessions.	Boyd-Walker, Joy, jrboyd1@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.

Turie T Small continues to be a PBIS, Positive Behavioral Supports and Interventions, school. The program rewards students and classes who exhibit positive behaviors and follow the Bulldog Bark- Be cooperative, accept responsibility, respect yourself and others, and keep safety first. Students earn positive referrals for exhibiting the BARK while whole classes receive Bulldog Bucks which are redeemed for class prizes. Expectations assemblies are held to teach the procedures and are reiterated frequently.

When students have behavioral issues or do not exhibit the BARK, restorative practices are utilized. This allows students to understand their behavior, accept responsibility, and move toward improving their behavior. Our goal is to teach children alternate behaviors to ensure a school environment that is safe, fun, free from distraction, and helps all children reach their maximum learning potential.

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

Cherise Webb-Moore is our guidance counselor and school contact who works with the district to ensure the success of PBIS. All faculty and staff receive training in PBIS and support the program through daily practices
including implementing the Bulldog BARK, Bulldog Bucks, and complimenting positive behaviors when noticed.

Hilton Garden Inn and Publix are both business partners who support PBIS and provide prizes for students and classes who exhibit positive behaviors. These incentives help to build up students while we work to build intrinsic motivation.

We implement multiple opportunities for students to receive outside support through mentoring including partnerships with ERAU, BCU and volunteer mentors.