

Volusia County Schools

Edith I. Starke Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Edith I. Starke Elementary School

730 S PARSONS AVE, Deland, FL 32720

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cortes, Catherine	Principal	Collaborate with SIP team and oversee the entire process of SIP implementation.
Robinson, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Collaborate with SIP team on creating SIP and input information into the state computer system. Also, to be contact person on SIP.
Ramsey, Zena	Instructional Coach	Collaborator on SIP, responsible for coaching teachers on benchmarks and providing feedback to teachers and administrative team.
Hudak, Anika	Teacher, K-12	Intervention teacher responsible for helping teachers teach to the benchmark standards while assisting teacher by providing intervention assistance in whole and small group arena for students in academic need.
Carver, Penny	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade team leader

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Starke Elementary's principal invited numerous administrative and teacher faculty members to be a part of the SIP team. The assistant principal, academic coach, intervention teacher and 2nd grade teacher responded in the affirmative. Therefore, that is how the SIP team was composed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored after each districtwide and statewide assessment through SIP monitoring meetings. The SIP team along with other stakeholders will explore data results from such assessments and compare Starke Elementary's data with the district and state assessment data. Particularly, the team will look at students that have been identified to have a disability. Those are our students with the greatest achievement gap. When necessary, Starke Elementary will revise our SIP to ensure continuous improvement by reviewing school-based and district driven assessment data.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	7	19	26	14	7	18	0	0	0	91	
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	6	4	7	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	6	14	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	3	12	6	5	0	0	0	33	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	3	7	7	15	0	0	0	39

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	12	1	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	35	10	8	11	5	6	0	0	0	75	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	5	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	15	10	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	13	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	35	10	8	11	5	6	0	0	0	75	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	5	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	15	10	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	13	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	38	52	53	28	53	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				39			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			50		
Math Achievement*	32	55	59	54	42	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				76			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77			45		
Science Achievement*	49	62	54	47	55	59	43		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	60	59	56			47		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	221
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	2	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	38			32			49					61
SWD	13			17							4	60
ELL	37			27			10				4	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			32			58				4	
HSP	39			34			33				5	62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43			33							2	
FRL	38			32			47				5	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	28	39	41	54	76	77	47					56
SWD	7	26		31	74		25					
ELL	36	41		66	81		47					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	37	43	52	74	75	42					
HSP	39	46		66	83		56					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	22	38		48	71							
FRL	28	41	43	54	76	77	49					56

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	52	50	46	60	45	43					47
SWD	22	18		31	44		12					40
ELL	26	50		38	60							47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	54		46	61		35					
HSP	34	55		46	64		67					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	27	36		45	64		30					50
FRL	35	53	55	46	61	50	43					47

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	57%	-24%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	53%	-14%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	57%	-25%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	59%	-31%	61%	-33%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	55%	-21%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	51%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to PM3 data, our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade math data had the lowest performance data. Our overall proficiency declined from 54% to 31%*. Contributing factors: our math coach was a first year math coach with no elementary math coach experience. Also, she taught math in the 4th and 5th grade classrooms for the entire instructional day. Our academic coach taught in classrooms more than 50% of the instructional day. Finally, there were multiple teacher vacancies (5th grade, 4th grade). Finally, new math benchmarks were introduced and teachers had to become familiar with those benchmarks.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our largest decline was 4th grade math. According to PM3 data, we declined from 56% proficiency 28% proficiency. Contributing factors, multiple teachers served in 4th grade classroom before leaving employment with Starke Elementary. Also, our 4th grade math intervention teacher took over a Kindergarten class in the middle of school year. Finally, new math benchmarks were introduced and teachers had to become familiar with those benchmarks.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

According to SSS data, our 4th grade math data had the greatest gap compared to the state. The state average was 61%. We were at 28% for a difference of 33%. Contributing factors, multiple teachers served in 4th grade classroom before leaving employment with Starke Elementary. Also, 4th grade math intervention teacher took over Kindergarten class in middle of school year. Finally, new math benchmarks were introduced and teachers had to become familiar with those benchmarks.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

According to PM3 data, our 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement. Our proficiency percentage rose from 22% to 46%. Contributing factors were that our ELA coach taught 5th grade ELA daily for the entire school year and consistently planned with other 5th grade teacher. Also, our intervention teacher was able to see small groups daily throughout the year. Finally, 5th grade departmentalized in ELA instruction. This worked well for us.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Student attendance remains a concern 36% of our students are missing 10% or more of the school year. According to the EWS data report, 13% of our students are showing a reading deficiency. Both of these are areas of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

The systems needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are:

Planning
Coaching
MTSS/Problem solving

A trend that has been identified is the need to provide ongoing monitoring of these systems to ensure implementation and impact.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

At Starke, we have had inconsistencies with the facilitation, and implementation of collaborative planning. There is work we need to do on defining and strengthening this system as well as how collaborative planning in order to support our Multi-systems of support in order to positively impact student outcomes and teacher practice.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Practice:

1. After the administration of PM1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with state growth trends.
2. By February of 2024, 60% of students will show proficiency on benchmark-aligned common assessments.

Teacher Practice:

1. By May of 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthroughs

Coaching Practice:

1. By April of 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support will decrease by 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

1. Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends
2. 60% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each benchmark-aligned common assessment is administered, teachers with the support of coaches will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practice:

1. Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
2. Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor for benchmark-aligned planning of tasks.

Coaching Practice:

1. Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.
2. Administration will collect coaching plans/notes and provide feedback to instructional coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Cortes (clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by school (coaches) and district based experts and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that teacher effectiveness is the most important school-based factor that influences student outcomes, including student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a master schedule that allows grade level collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coach. Leadership team will create a common planning protocol that defines expectations for before, during, and after planning.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cortes (clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 7, 2023

Coaches will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Zena Ramsey (zjramsey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly basis until May 3, 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus of positive culture and environment was chosen due to the fact that we had a high number of absentees last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Practice:

The measurable outcome we plan to achieve this year is to lower the number of students with 10% or more absentees from 91 students to 75 students or less by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

1. Schoolwide attendance records will be reviewed on a regular 4-week basis.
2. Teachers will discuss attendance at each grade level PLC meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Cortes (clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Principal and assistant principal will determine what extrinsic rewards will be offered to students to help increase regular attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that many students respond to extrinsic rewards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Review attendance records weekly.

Distribute rewards to students on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cortes (clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly beginning September 29, 2023

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process that will be used to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs is to have all allocations decided on and/or reviewed by the school advisory council (SAC). The council will meet monthly to discuss progress towards the school's SIP goals and funding allocations for student improvement. Decisions for funding will be decided at that time.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Kindergarten below grade level: 0% of students based on iReady diagnostic 3 progress monitoring.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on tier 1 core instruction and tasks that will align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content area expert to align instruction with benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on iReady diagnostic data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical need area.

1st grade below grade level: 19% of students based on iReady diagnostic 3 progress monitoring.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on tier 1 core instruction and tasks that will align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content area expert to align instruction to benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based solely on iReady diagnostic data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical need area.

2nd Grade below grade level: 20% of students based on iReady diagnostic 3 progress monitoring.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on tier 1 core instruction and tasks that will align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content area expert to align instruction to benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based solely on iReady diagnostic data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical need area.

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

3rd Grade below grade level 25% of students based on 2023 end of year FSA data.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on tier 1 core instruction and tasks that will align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content area expert to align instruction to benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on FSA data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical need area.

4th Grade below grade level: 30% of students based on 2023 end of year FSA data.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on tier 1 core instruction and tasks that will align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content area expert to align instruction to benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on FSA data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical need area.

5th Grade below grade level: 45% of students based on 2023 end of year FSA data.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on tier 1 core instruction and tasks that will align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content area expert to align instruction to benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on FSA data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical need area.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

K-2: We plan on achieving 75% proficiency for each grade level at Starke Elementary in reading.

Kindergarten 2023 end of year data : 0% of students were below grade level; therefore, 100% were on track to be on grade level by 3rd grade. Based on this, we can reasonably anticipate at least 75% of our current kindergartners will be on grade level by the end of the year based on progress monitoring.

1st Grade 2023 end of the year data: 19% of students were below grade level; therefore, 81% of our 1st graders were on track to be on level by the 3rd grade. Based on this we are aiming for 75% or better of our current 1st graders to be on level by the end of the year based on progress monitoring.

2nd Grade 2023 end of the year data: %10 of students were below grade level; therefore, 90% of our 2nd graders were on track to be on level by the 3rd grade. Based on this, we are aiming for at least 75% of our current 2nd graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd-5th: We plan on achieving 75% proficiency for each grade level at Starke Elementary in reading.

3rd Grade 2023 end of year FSA data: 25% of our students were below grade level; therefore, 75% were on grade level. Based on this, we are aiming for 73% or more of our current 3rd graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on progress monitoring.

4th Grade 2023 end of year FSA data: 25% of our students were below grade level; therefore, 75% were on grade level. Based on this, we are aiming for 75% or more of our current 4th graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on progress monitoring.

5th Grade 2023 end of year FSA data: 45% of our students were below grade level; therefore, 55% were on grade level. Based on this, we are aiming for 75% or more of our current 5th graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on progress monitoring.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Area of Focus 1 for instructional practice : Improving Tier 1 instruction through the actions steps of collaborative ongoing MTSS professional learning, ongoing progress monitoring professional learning and weekly collaborative planning and preparation with a content area expert to support teachers. Area of Focus 1 will be monitored with district ELA assessments and ongoing progress monitoring using district provided research-based diagnostic screeners and monitoring tools. Weekly PLCs will be utilized to monitor, analyze and prescribe action steps based on the collected data. Monitoring data consistently throughout the school year will compel Starke Elementary to be proactive with adjusting instruction and interventions to address the needs the student data reveals. By monitoring the data throughout the year, we will be able to work toward our proficiency goals for each grade level.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cortes, Catherine, clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

MTSS professional learning take s place throughout the school year and is district-driven. RTI will be used for K-5 to monitor interventions and student progression of reading skills. RTI has an effect size of 1.07, which is a strong effect size. The RTI model to monitor student progress meets the state's definition of a strong evidenced based practice

Resources used with during Walk To Intervention are all aligned with B.E.S.T. ELA standards: SIPPS foundational reading, Benchmark Advanced Curriculum, and Magnetic Reading.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The resources that were chosen are based on the district provided decision trees. The decision trees only suggest research-based programs. SIPPS is a research-based reading program that is utilized by our K-3 grade students to sequentially and systematically teach and directly apply the foundational skills of reading. The skills taught in SIPPS align with B.E.S.T. standards and the science of reading. When implemented with fidelity, the SIPPS program has achieved results that demonstrated greater success than control groups who do not receive SIPPS. Benchmark Advance Curriculum is tightly aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards and has shown success when implemented with fidelity. Magnetic Reading is aligned with B.E.S.T. standards and has shown success when implemented with fidelity.

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>MTSS district-driven professional learning</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Data will be monitored and analyzed by the administrative literacy leadership team throughout the year to determine effectiveness of implementation and impact.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Content specific coaches (school-based and district-based coaches) will support classroom teachers with instructional decision making based on student needs.</p> <p>Assessment: District assessments will be monitored with the goal of progressing ??% of students to proficiency.</p> <p>Professional Learning: 4 two hour learning sessions throughout the school year.</p>	<p>Cortes, Catherine, clcortes@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Collaborative Planning</p> <p>Literacy Leadership: Walkthrough data will be monitored and analyzed by the administrative literacy leadership team throughout the year to determine effectiveness of implementation and impact.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Content -specific coaches will support classroom teachers with instructional decision-making based on data from tier 1 instruction. Benchmark aligned instruction and tasks will be the focus.</p> <p>Assessment: District assessments will be monitored with goal of progressing ??% of students to proficiency. Assessment data will be used when planning for benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks.</p> <p>Professional Learning: 1 two hour professional learning for ELA collaboration will take place during the school year in conjunction with with collaborative planning sessions. During both, content-specific coaches will be present to support teachers lesson designing to be benchmark aligned.</p>	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Yearly Open house SIP presentation

School Website

In-person visits to community stakeholders

School social media platforms

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Inviting parents/community members to be a member of the school's PTO.

Inviting parents/community members to be a member of the school's SAC.

Yearly school open house night.

Parent/Teacher conferences

Annual cultural celebrations held on campus

Science/math nights

Open-door policy of communication

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

First and foremost, to strengthen the academic program in the school and increase the amount of quality learning, Starke Elementary will use district teaching resources with fidelity. The use of the resources will be monitored by administration, content area coaches and intervention teachers. Faculty and staff will monitor and celebrate all student achievement (academic and behavioral). Next, we will use an ELA intervention block. The intervention block will be used for remediation and acceleration for those students who are showing complete mastery of the current subject matter. Finally, We will use federal grants (ESSER III, ARP, IAWA and Title 1 funds for math intervention tutoring and math supplies.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A