Edith I. Starke Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edith I. Starke Elementary School

730 S PARSONS AVE, Deland, FL 32720

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

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Aivazis A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2022

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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Edith I. Starke Elementary School

730 S PARSONS AVE, Deland, FL 32720

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/starke/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	79%

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.

At Edith I. Starke Elementary our mission is to provide a safe and positive culture to ensure ALL students are learning at high levels, so they are college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Edith I. Starke will be recognized as an Outstanding Elementary School in Volusia County that sends its learners to the next level prepared at the highest level. Edith I. Starke will be recognized Nationally as a Professional Learning Community School.

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
Ahr, Eileen	Principal	To be the instructional leader at the school, by supporting teachers with curriculum, providing frequent observations with feedback to change instructional practice for the better.
Robinson, Jamie	Assistant Principal	To be the instructional leader at the school, by supporting teachers with curriculum, providing frequent observations with feedback to change instructional practice for the better. To support teachers with student discipline.
Cervantes, Amy	Reading Coach	To support teachers in ELA instruction.
Ramsey, Zena	Teacher, K-12	To instruct students in all content areas.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/16/2022, Jessica Aivazis A

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
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

310

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

8

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

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	43	49	46	54	41	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277
Attendance below 90 percent	35	10	8	11	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 8/16/2022

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	44	50	52	40	40	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Attendance below 90 percent	7	26	22	21	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	5	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	1	4	1	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	

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	44	50	52	40	40	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Attendance below 90 percent	7	26	22	21	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	5	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	1	4	1	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	

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	28%	53%	56%				44%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						50%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						48%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	42%	50%				53%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						48%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	77%						36%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	55%	59%				54%	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	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
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	7	26		31	74		25				
ELL	36	41		66	81		47				
BLK	24	37	43	52	74	75	42				
HSP	39	46		66	83		56				
WHT	22	38		48	71						
FRL	28	41	43	54	76	77	49				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	18		31	44		12				
ELL	26	50		38	60						
BLK	36	54		46	61		35				
HSP	34	55		46	64		67				
WHT	27	36		45	64		30				
FRL	35	53	55	46	61	50	43				

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	28	37	29	37	50	41	33				
ELL	45	48	47	52	44	38	46				
BLK	41	51	43	49	46	31	55				
HSP	46	36	33	46	43	36	46				
WHT	42	75		68	68						
FRL	43	49	48	53	49	36	53				

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	52
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	58
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	45
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	53
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?

The trends that emerge across grade levels is that our ELA has dropped in our 3rd and 5th grade and went up in our 4th grade. As for our subgroups all dropped in ELA with the exception of our ELL and Hispanic students. In math every grade level improved, with our 4th and 5th grades making the most improvements. Every subgroup improved with our Hispanic and ELL reaching 60% or higher on the achievement

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

After reviewing the data our ELA component has the greatest need for improvement. Our SWD dropped the most from a 22% proficient to only 7% proficient.

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

One of the barriers we had was only being afforded a half time reading intervention teacher. She was new to the district and with new benchmarks and curriculum. Teachers were also new to the benchmarks and curriculum. Our third - fifth grade teachers taught the new benchmarks but were tested on the old standards. What new actions- I was able to use half of my title one money and the district gave me a half time intervention teacher- so I have one full time ELA intervention teacher. We are also moving forward with our Essential Benchmarks in ELA. Last year we focused only in primary with our Essential ELA Benchmarks and have a solid plan for this year in 3-5.

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

The area of math showed the greatest improvement. Our 54% achievement is the highest Starke has had in years. However, our Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile Gains were 76% and 77% respectively. Every subgroup improved in the three areas of math.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement we our intentional instruction with our Power Standards in math. We have focused on 10 power standards in every grade level for the past two years. We did not have a math intervention teacher so our coach and toa pulled intentional groups. During our intervention time teachers only worked on the power standards. We had intentional conversation during our PLCs about the power standards to ensure all students were becoming proficient with them.

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

We reviewed the new math benchmarks and as teams selected Essential Benchmarks for each grade level. We will be pretesting and the benchmarks and them during our intervention time students will work on the benchmarks they need. We will also be using IXL and Reflex math to continue this path.

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

We have asked for district support to come out and model the math block with the new curriculum. Teachers will use collaborative team planning to plan, practice teaching to ensure they are meeting the rigor of the benchmark.

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

We will continue build our Professional Learning Communities- We are using Global PD to onboard new teachers and strengthen the structures that we have.

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 Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	This area is an area of focus due to having only 7% of our students with disabilities proficient on the state exam which dropped from 22% the year before .
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By February of 2023, 50% of students with disabilities will show proficiency on Power benchmarks in ELA. By May of 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs. Coaching practice, by April 2023, the number for teachers receiving Tiered support will decrease by 50%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	~Power Benchmarks will be monitored through data tracking with the teachers and students. ~Common formative and summative assessments will be monitored around the Power Benchmarks. ~We will also monitor specific programs related to IEP services. ~We will be conducting Learning walks using our Teacher Clarity Coaching Tool. Our Look Fors are Clarity of Explanation, Clarity of Examples and Guided Practice, Clarity of Assessment. ~We will monitoring through quarterly data chats ~Through PLC intentional conversation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Cervantes (alcervan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Intentional small group instruction based on the power benchmarks in ELA. This will be monitored through planning, walk throughs with a focus on Clarity of Explanation and Clarity of Examples and Guided Practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rational for selecting this specific strategy is it has a high effect size of .47. The resources we used to support this decision was the work of John Hattie.

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.

~Continue clarifying new ELA Benchmarks
~Implementing highly effective UDL strategies
~Implementing WICOR strategies with a focus on collaboration
~Inclusive with Walk to Extension
~Provide additional time in the schedule for students with disabilities
~Use of color coding from Core Connection to support reading and writing
~Initiating student assistants- coaching students to support their peers learning.

Person Responsible	Amy Cervantes (alcervan@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 to increase student achievement in the overall ELA achievement area to 41% from 28%. This was identified as a area of focus as we decreased from 35% to 28%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By February of 2023, 75% of all students will show proficiency on our Power Benchmarks through common assessments. By May of 2023, 90% of all teachers will provide students benchmark aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs. Coaching practice, by April 2023, the number of teachers receiving Tiered support will decrease by 50%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	~We will monitor Power Benchmarks through data tracking by both the students and teachers. ~Monitor using district assessments (diagnostic, formative, and summative) This data will drive our instructional practices. ~Monitor during walkthroughs ~We will monitor using Mastery test. ~We will monitor through quarterly data chats ~Though weekly PLC intentional conversation ~Our Look Fors Tool is our Teacher Clarity Coaching Tool. Our Look Fors are Clarity of Explanation, Clarity of Examples and Guided Practice, Clarity of Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Intentional small group instruction. This will be monitored through planning, walk throughs with a focus on Clarity of Explanation and Clarity of Examples and Guided Practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rational for selecting this specific strategy is it has a high effect size of .47. The resources we used to support this decision was the work of John Hattie.

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.

~Connect Power Benchmarks in Extension block with focus standard
~Implementing highly effective UDL strategies
~Implementing WICOR strategies with a focus on collaboration
~Conduct walk throughs during core instruction
~Continue training on new materials

~Use of color coding from Core Connections to support reading and writing
~Initiating student assistants- coaching students to help others.

Person Responsible   Eileen Ahr (ecahr@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

In our K-2 grade levels we have established Essential ELA Benchmarks- In K and 1st our teachers will be focusing on the foundational skills to ensure our students are learning the foundation. This will happen not only through the whole group curriculum, but our small group is very intentional on the foundational skills. In 2nd grade the teachers will focus on the foundational skills along with four reading benchmarks and fluency. All Essential Benchmarks are discussed during PLCs with intentional discussion around our students with disabilities. All students in K-2 will also participate in a walk to SIPPs. This time is on a bell schedule so the level of importance is felt throughout the school. Each teacher has a folder for every child in their classroom. The reading coach provides training, modeling and supports teachers once they have started. All support teachers will focus on providing intentional instruction in their small group. All teachers will embed WICOR Strategies and collaborative structures that promote higher level thinking. Special Area teachers will include vocabulary in their lessons- music and art will create a word wall. We will use the decision tree for every student to support their instruction like a prescription. Reading counts will be pushed in the younger grades. Teachers will have data chats with their students on their progress, as well as administration will have data chats with teachers quarterly.

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

In grades 3-5 we also have selected Essential ELA Benchmarks which are the reading benchmarks. Knowing that our 3rd graders are our students who missed the last quarter of their Kindergarten and then had a very weak 1st grade due to the Pandemic we know that their foundational skills are weak

also, so many of them will need the support with SIPPS. During this walk to students are assessed on the foundational skills so they will get the support they need. Our 4th and 5th will also be assessed and we will focus on using Rewards if the students need foundational support, and fluency. If they fall into the fluency/comprehension group we will be using Magnetic Resources that support our curriculum. All Essential Benchmarks are discussed during PLCs with intentional discussion around our students with disabilities. Our Reading intervention teacher will be supporting our Tier 3 students in these grade levels. Our reading coach will provide training, modeling and support as teachers navigate the curriculum. All support teachers will focus on providing intentional instruction in their small group. All teachers will embed WICOR Strategies and collaborative structures that promote higher level thinking. Special Area teachers will include vocabulary in their lessons- music and art will create a word wall. We will use the decision tree for every student to support their instruction like a prescription. Reading counts will be pushed in the younger grades. Teachers will have data chats with their students on their progress, as well as administration will have data chats with teachers quarterly.

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)

90% of the students in K-2 will master all foundational skills.
We will see 100% students showing growth on the STAR Test

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

100% of students will show growth on the second iReady diagnostic and FAST in January 2023

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.

During PLCs for ELA the intervention and support teachers will attend to provide data on their students.
Data Chats quarterly with teachers.
Monitor district and common formative and summative assessments.

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

Ahr, Eileen, ecahr@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?

Evidence-based practices/programs being implemented are ELA Benchmark Advance Curriculum aligned to BEST Standards, SIPPS in K-3 to address foundational skills, daily intentional 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 us 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.

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 task are aligned to the benchmark. Literacy Leadership, Literacy Coaching team, including District Transformation Resources Teachers, will facilitate professional learning on the Collaborative planning protocol. Formative and summative assessment data will be considered during planning.	Ahr, Eileen, ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us
Monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and Monthly School Leadership Team Meetings. Academic Coach, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and 3students through progress monitoring will occur and instructional decision made to increase student achievement.	Ahr, Eileen, ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us
Select teachers will participate in ongoing tier 1 and 2 level coaching support with the ELA academic coach. This support will include observation, feedback, modeling, lesson planning, assessment review, and appropriate mini professional learning sessions.	Cervantes, Amy, alcervan@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.

Our mission is to ensure a safe and positive culture so that all students can learn at high levels. I talk about the mission every day on the morning announcements. We discuss our PRIDE acronym every day along with having a monetary system through out the school. This year teachers can give them out to their students by connecting to the PRIDE acronym, students can then once a week go shopping in our school store. As a faculty we are doing a book study using "Hacking School Discipline" to bring in restorative justice practices to build a positive school culture.

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

The stakeholder involved in promoting a positive school culture and environment are:
Principal- Vision and Mission
Assistant Principal- Supporting students/mentoring
School Counselor - mentoring/small groups
Teachers- setting expectations and procedures that lend to productive and positive culture in the classroom

Parents- following up and supporting school needs
Community members- mentoring