

Volusia County Schools

George W. Marks 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 | 10 |
| 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 | 22 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 24 |

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/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.

Through the cooperative support of the school, family, and community, our students will develop academic and citizenship skills to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

George Marks Elementary, where everyone succeeds together!

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| YOUNG, SHANNON | Principal | |
| Baker, Joselyn | Assistant Principal | |
| Barger, Julie | Teacher, ESE | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings and provide input on School Improvement Plan. and professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place. |
| Thomas, Megan | Teacher, K-12 | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings and provide input on School Improvement Plan. and professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place. |
| Pegler, Kristin | Teacher, K-12 | Provide teacher and student voice; attend SLT meetings and provide input on School Improvement Plan. and professional learning. Ensure small group plans, intervention/remediation plans, and common experiments are in place. |
| Freed, Dora | Instructional Coach | Facilitate PL; Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student data and groupings and planning for intervention/enrichment. Collaborative Planning with grade levels focused on SIP goal, content knowledge, and standards Create coaching support plan to support teacher growth in small group and whole group instruction. |

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.

Selection of stakeholders is determined by job roles and responsibilities within the school site. These individuals are leaders within our school community and have involvement in the classrooms. Input from faculty meetings, parent organizations and school advisory committee were considered into the development of this plan.

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 school leadership team will monitor monthly through a series of different lenses. Looking at data trends in discipline, academics, and attendance, timely adjustments will be made to obtain designated goals. Initiatives created through the SIP will be implemented by designated members of the leadership team. Quarterly data chats with teachers and students will determine students' tier of support needed for achievement and learning gains. The stocktake process will take place in October and February as a way to measure progress and refocus efforts towards SIP goal achievement.

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 | 45% |
| 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 | 2021-22: B |

| | |
|---|--|
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 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 | 65 | 138 | 127 | 147 | 100 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 716 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 36 | 34 | 38 | 22 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 37 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 22 | 25 | 30 | 29 | 33 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 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 | 14 | 14 | 16 | 31 | 21 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 32 | 32 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 30 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 14 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| | 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 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 20 | 28 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 32 | 32 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 30 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 14 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| | 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 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 20 | 28 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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* | 50 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 56 | 54 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 64 | | | 47 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56 | | | 46 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 53 | 55 | 59 | 53 | 42 | 50 | 50 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62 | | | 45 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52 | | | 14 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 61 | 62 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 59 | 55 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 59 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 58 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 61 | 60 | 59 | 50 | | | 59 | | |

* 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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 282 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 445 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| 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 | 28 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 43 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |

| 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% |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 50 | | | |

| 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 | 38 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 41 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | |
| HSP | 46 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

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 | 50 | | | 53 | | | 61 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 20 | | | 26 | | | 31 | | | | 5 | 41 |
| ELL | 24 | | | 33 | | | 29 | | | | 5 | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | | | 37 | | | 40 | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 35 | | | 40 | | | 40 | | | | 5 | 61 |

| 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 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | 61 | | | 78 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 41 | | | 44 | | | 54 | | | | 5 | 61 |

| 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 | 54 | 64 | 56 | 53 | 62 | 52 | 54 | | | | | 50 |
| SWD | 20 | 44 | 40 | 32 | 57 | 48 | 35 | | | | | 27 |
| ELL | 34 | 42 | 35 | 33 | 51 | 47 | 35 | | | | | 50 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 100 | | 35 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 48 | 41 | 44 | 55 | 47 | 43 | | | | | 48 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 68 | 60 | 57 | 68 | 60 | 61 | | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 58 | 54 | 46 | 60 | 50 | 49 | | | | | 51 |

| 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 | 54 | 47 | 46 | 50 | 45 | 14 | 55 | | | | | 59 |
| SWD | 23 | 35 | 44 | 17 | 13 | 14 | 22 | | | | | 43 |
| ELL | 32 | 42 | 46 | 29 | 30 | 9 | 29 | | | | | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 8 | | | 17 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 45 | 47 | 37 | 34 | 15 | 27 | | | | | 60 |
| MUL | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 45 | | 60 | 54 | | 77 | | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 47 | 45 | 48 | 42 | 38 | 15 | 48 | | | | | 59 |

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 | 50% | 53% | -3% | 54% | -4% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 57% | -1% | 58% | -2% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 53% | 2% | 50% | 5% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 57% | -3% | 59% | -5% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 59% | -3% | 61% | -5% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 55% | 2% | 55% | 2% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 61% | 5% | 51% | 15% |

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.

English Language Arts showed an achievement level of 54% for three years in a row, demonstrating a lack of growth. Contributing factors include curriculum changes, lack of a stable coach, increased enrollment, and teacher knowledge of benchmarks.

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

Although a decline from the prior year was not present in English Language Arts, there has been no growth over a three-year period. Factors contributing to the lack of growth include teacher knowledge of benchmarks, gaps in practice for teachers, implementation gaps, and alignment of resources and tasks.

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 PM3 data, our 4th grade English Language Arts had the greatest gap compared to the state. The state average was 57%. We were at 56% for a difference of 1%. The scale score for the state was 312 and our scale score was 309. Contributing factors include teacher knowledge of benchmarks, gaps in practice for teachers, implementation gaps, and alignment of resources and tasks.

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

The data component demonstrating the most improvement was 5th grade Science from 54% to 66% for a difference of 12%. Some contributing factors were the cohesive implementation of Science standards in Special Areas and in other subjects, weekly experiments, and teacher knowledge of standards.

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

Student referrals remain a main concern from a total of 436 in 2022 to 600 in 2023. This is a difference of 164 additional referrals in 2023. Second grade, the upcoming third grade had the highest number of referrals and the period of 10:30-11:30 a.m. peaked the highest timeframe for referrals. Additionally, hitting and striking was the offense with highest frequency.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are planning, coaching, and PBIS. A trend has been identified is the need to provide ongoing monitoring of these systems to ensure there is evidence of 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 ELA**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 GME, 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 supports our MTSS in order to positively impact student outcomes and teacher practice. English language arts achievement levels at 54% for three years in a row demonstrate a need for collaborative planning to positively impact student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable outcomes to progressively achieve our area of focus of collaborative planning should demonstrate student practice:

After administration of MP1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with state growth trends. By February of 2024, 62% of students will show proficiency on benchmark-aligned common assessments.

Teacher Practice:

-By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will ask questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning as evidenced in walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice:

-By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%.

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

-Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.

-62% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each district assessment administration, teachers with the support of the coach will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher practice:

Classroom Instruction walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.

Administration and coach will attend common planning to monitor for benchmark-aligned instruction, specifically planned questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning.

Coaching Practice:

-Administration and coach will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.

-Administration will collect coaching plans/notes and provide feedback to instructional coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@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.)

Weekly collaborative planning with a coach providing professional learning on questioning techniques to deepen the intended learning of benchmarks.

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. Professional development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention as evidenced by the Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Professional Development Validation Study by Meyers et al., 2016,

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.

Grade levels will develop their planning protocol.

Person Responsible: Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Planning protocols will be developed by grade levels during the professional learning community meeting on Tuesday, August 29th.

Collect baseline data of 4 Look fors in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Baseline data will be completed by September 18th.

Develop a tiered coaching support plan with walkthrough baseline data and assessment.

Person Responsible: Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Tiered coaching support plan will be developed by 9/20/23.

Create a coaching schedule for support indicating focus, frequency, and method of support.

Person Responsible: SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Schedule for coaching will be completed by September.

Monitor planning and give feedback on the implementation of instruction.

Person Responsible: SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This action will be ongoing throughout the school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

GME's 2022-2023 discipline data shows a total of 600 referrals. Student referrals remain a main concern from a total of 436 in 2022 to 600 in 2023 with a difference of 164 additional referrals in 2023. Second grade, the upcoming third grade had the highest number of referrals, hitting and striking the highest offense, and the period of 10:30-11:30 a.m. peaked the highest timeframe for referrals. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) were initiated with room for growth last year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable goal will be that school referrals will decrease from 600 (with an increase in student population) by 5% utilizing the PBIS program schoolwide.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the count of school referrals quarterly through data dashboards in administrative and faculty meeting. By using the PBIS survey results, and REA discipline data, we will make timely adjustments and offer coaching on behavioral strategies to support students' need. We are now implementing the BARK warning systems to help eliminate the number of overall referrals. We are also focused on positive reinforcement with rewards and student spotlights.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@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.)

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is the evidence based to be implemented for this area of focus. Research demonstrate students' improvement in overall discipline and learning. Jolstead, K. A., Caldarella, P., Hansen, B., Korth, B. B., Williams, L., Kamps, D. (2017). Implementing Positive Behavior Support in Preschools: An Exploratory Study of CW- FIT Tier 1. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 19(1) 48-60.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Blair (2021), engaging student voice in the PBIS schoolwide program can encourage student attainment of school expectations. Increase in positive reinforcement and student voice will positively impact the student disciplinary data.

Lloyd, B. P., Carter, E. W., Hine, M. C., Davis, A. D., Lanchak, E. R., Ferrell, M. A., Axelroth, T. L., Shuster, B. C., Haynes, R. L., Higgs, J., & Chauvin, C. B. (2023). Student Perspectives on Implementation and Impact of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in Their Middle Schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 25(2), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007221082961>

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.

Multi-Tier Reward system for whole group and individual students.

Person Responsible: Colleen Adkins (cadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Whole group reward will be awarded after 25 "Dog Bones" while individual rewards will be awarded daily and monthly.

Monthly drawing in addition to treasure box for intermediate students receiving a "BARK Brag".

Person Responsible: Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly drawings will be completed by the last week of each month.

Survey parents, teachers, staff, and students to gather feedback and increase voice from each stakeholder.

Person Responsible: Colleen Adkins (cadkins@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Survey 1 will take place on 9/21/23 and survey 2 will be administered on 1/25/24.

Student discipline and PBIS assemblies to educate students on schoolwide expectations.

Person Responsible: Joselyn Baker (jbaker1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Student assemblies will be held by the first two weeks of school.

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).

Each expenditure will be aligned to the focus areas listed in the SIP and monitored by the school leadership team. Parent organization will share input into the expenses during the monthly school advisory committee meetings.

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

Instructional practice specifically related to Reading is intervention and collaborative planning with essential teacher led questions that will deepen the understanding of the intended benchmark.

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

Instructional practice specifically related to Reading is intervention and collaborative planning with essential teacher led questions that will deepen the understanding of the intended 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 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

The intervention program will increase the percentage of students moving from one SIPPS program level to the next to 80%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The intervention program for third grade will increase the percentage of students moving from one SIPPS program level to the next to 80%. In addition, 80% of fourth and fifth teachers will develop and implement questioning to deepen understanding of the intended benchmark as observed in district "Look fors".

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.

Monitoring of the intervention program will consist of administrative observations of groups, review of student progress as evidenced by mastery assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

YOUNG, SHANNON, sbyoung@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?

According to Scarborough (2001), the reading rope is made up of lower and upper strands. When all these components parts intertwine, it results in skilled and accurate, fluent reading with strong comprehension. Phonics is one of the lower strands.

Reference

Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. Neuman & D. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook for research in early literacy*. New York: Guilford Press.

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?

Decoding is the ability to apply knowledge of sound letter relationships (phonics) to correctly pronounce written words (Scarborough, 2001).

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 |
|--|---|
| Assess K-3 students' phonics with SIPPS placement tests. | Cone, Amanda, akcone@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Develop intervention groups, schedules, and enlist providers | Cone, Amanda, akcone@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Implement walk to intervention for grades K-3 for five days a week. | Cone, Amanda, akcone@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Administer Mastery Assessments | Cone, Amanda, akcone@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Make adjustments following mastery assessments, progress monitoring, and data chats. | Cone, Amanda, akcone@volusia.k12.fl.us |

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.

The school leadership team will share the data analysis and areas of focus for the school improvement plan during preservice meeting. Leadership team will discuss the school improvement plan with the school advisory committee and will gather input from the community as well. Two Title I meetings will be held to discuss the SIP with parents and gather their input for the actions needed to achieve our goals.

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))

George Marks Elementary will hold Parent Involvement Nights including Literacy Night, Light up GME, Hispanic Heritage Science Night, Publix Math Night and participate in community events such as the Rotary Christmas parade and Mardi Gras Dog parade. These events will include the Leadership Team, teachers from other Volusia County Schools, and PTA. We also host Meet the Teacher day, Open House night and Title 1 Parent Meetings. PTA will also be involved with school based activities. We will also be implementing schoolwide PBIS. We have embedded Social and Emotional Learning into our schedule to build classroom community. Parents will be frequently engaged in their child's learning progress.

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)

Agriculture as a special area rotation focusing on science, health, and social emotional learning standards. Personalized learning through district approved programs will support accelerated curriculum for students. Coaching cycles will be provided for all instructional staff to build teaching capacity which will positively impact the quality of learning.

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))

This plan enhances teaching practice that improves student learning and achievement by offering additional coaching support in planning. In addition to the focus for implementation of instruction, a positive behavioral plan will ensure student productivity to close the achievement gap.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

School counselor provides online referral forms for student, parents, and teachers needing services. Referral to outside agencies for students that need additional services are also secured. Social emotional learning is provided in all classrooms. Morning announcements with a daily motivational message for character education is an extension outside the academic subject area. GME works in coordination with outside agencies to provide on campus counseling support. Monthly threat assessment team meetings monitor and support at risk students. Referrals are provided for 504 and gifted services. Bullying anonymous reporting is available in common areas. Kindness week, small group counseling, and grandparent support group enrich students skills outside the academic subject areas.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Career awareness and interest, goal setting, learning styles in counseling program, along with guest speakers offer awareness of postsecondary and workforce opportunities for students. Special events like Vehicle Day and Literacy week with guest speakers enrich students' awareness of technical careers.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) is implemented to proactively support students behavioral needs and intervene with research based strategies in collaboration with district support staff and faculty. Teachers refer students to the MTSS chair to discuss the progress of research based interventions and make referrals when necessary. Other supports act in collaboration with the MTSS when necessary to identify eligible services for students with disabilities. ABA therapies provide additional support for students who qualify for behavioral coaching.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Preservice professional learning supports faculty and paraprofessionals in best practices for classroom instruction. Data analysis and collaborative planning during professional learning communities time is recurrent to support instructional practice. Coaching for all teachers and mentoring of new teachers is another support system to retain effective teachers. Onboarding program for new teachers and hosting college interns is our school effort for recruiting effective teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Speech services are available to screen and support children not serviced at the school setting. Child Find and Easter Seals refer students to the local elementary school programs.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No