**Volusia County Schools** 

# Coronado Beach 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                            | 11 |
|   |    |
| III. Planning for Improvement                               | 16 |
|   |    |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review                       | 22 |
|   |    |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
|   |    |
| VI. Title I Requirements                                    | 24 |
| <del>-</del>  |    |
| VII Budget to Support Areas of Focus                        | 26 |

# **Coronado Beach Elementary School**

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/coronadobeach/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), <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">https://www.floridacims.org</a>, 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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 focused collaboration, the teachers, faculty and staff of Coronado Beach Elementary School will work together to encourage best practices around academics, behavior, and citizenship resulting in academic success, and a positive impact on achievement for all.

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

At Coronado Beach Elementary, we strive to educate all students as we enable them to reach and expand their best potential. We promise to provide a quality education which will prepare them to become successful, productive, responsible, and compassionate members of society.

#### 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              | e Position<br>Title     | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Scott,<br>Carlos  | Principal               | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff,  Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
| Quigley<br>Kim    | <sup>y,</sup> Other     | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff,  Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
| Wasse<br>Christir | m, Teacher,<br>ne K-12  | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff,  Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
| Cloer,<br>Debbie  | Teacher,<br>K-12        | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff,  Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
|                   | a, Teacher,<br>eth K-12 | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff,  Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |

| Name                 | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Scalo,<br>Jenifer    | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff, Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
| Copp,<br>Kaitlyn     | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff, Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
| Canfield,<br>Jessica | School<br>Counselor    | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff, Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |
| Green,<br>Ashley     | Instructional<br>Coach | Helping to ensure communication of important information occurs between staff and administration.  Supporting the professional learning and growth of colleagues, Promoting a positive climate and culture focused on learning and FUN for students and staff, Helping brainstorm creative ways to ensure all students demonstrate understanding of all benchmarks taught Serving as a liaison between their department members and other stakeholders. |

#### 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.

The School Advisory Council is shown the School Improvement Plan at the first meeting of the year. Feedback from all stakeholders on SAC is solicited, which then guide revisions before submission. Additionally, members of the instructional leadership team meet to review data on a weekly basis. Grade

Chairs (lead collaborators) are also asked for input in SIP development and to participate in the Mid Year review.

#### **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 for effective implementation during weekly instructional leadership meetings, monthly lead collaborator meetings, and monthly SAC meetings. Faculty meetings that occur on a bi-monthly basis will cover SIP updated progress through our SIP one-pager document. Through review and analysis of collected data while sharing with a variety of stakeholders we will be able to monitor for effective implementation, have an impact on increasing student achievement, and revise the plan as necessary.

#### **Demographic Data**

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

| 2023-24 Status  | Active                              |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (per MSID File)   | Flomentary Cahaal                   |
| School Type and Grades Served                                   | Elementary School                   |
| (per MSID File)   | PK-5                                |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)                         | K-12 General Education              |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status                                   | No                                  |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate   | 10%                                 |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate                   | 62%                                 |
| Charter School  | No                                  |
| RAISE School  | No                                  |
| ESSA Identification   |                                     |
| *updated as of 3/11/2024  | N/A                                 |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)          | No                                  |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented                              | Students With Disabilities (SWD)    |
| (subgroups with 10 or more students)                            | White Students (WHT)                |
| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an   | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| asterisk)   | (FRL)                               |
|   | 2021-22: A                          |
| School Grades History   | 2019-20: A                          |
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2018-19: A                          |
|   | 2017-18: A                          |
| 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 |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator   | K | 1 | 2 | 3           | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0 | 7 | 6 | 7           | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31    |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3           | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |       |  |  |  |  |  |

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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|
| Indicator                            | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |  |  |  |

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

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

#### 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 |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator   | K | 1 | 2 | 3           | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 2 | 8 | 4 | 10          | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39    |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |  | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator                            | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |  |  |  |  |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### The number of students identified retained:

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

#### 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 |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator   | K | 1 | 2 | 3           | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 2 | 8 | 4 | 10          | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39    |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0           | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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                            |   |   | ( | Grad | de L | evel | l |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|------|------|------|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0    | 3    | 3    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |

#### The number of students identified retained:

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

## 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.

| A                                  |        | 2023     |       |        | 2022     |       | 2021   |          |       |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| Accountability Component           | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                   | 85     | 52       | 53    | 76     | 53       | 56    | 78     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains                 |        |          |       | 64     |          |       | 58     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile         |        |          |       | 44     |          |       |        |          |       |
| Math Achievement*                  | 93     | 55       | 59    | 77     | 42       | 50    | 70     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains                |        |          |       | 81     |          |       | 46     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile        |        |          |       | 53     |          |       |        |          |       |
| Science Achievement*               | 100    | 62       | 54    | 84     | 55       | 59    | 75     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*        |        |          |       |        | 59       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration         |        |          |       |        | 45       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                    |        |          |       |        | 58       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career<br>Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                       |        | 60       | 59    |        |          |       |        |          |       |

<sup>\*</sup> 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)               | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 94  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 374 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 4   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Last Modified: 4/18/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 12 of 26

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested             | 100 |
| Graduation Rate            |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 68  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 479 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# **ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

|                  |                                       | 2022-23 ES               | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAR                               | Y .   |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |
| SWD              | 90                                    |                          |   |   |
| ELL              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| ASN              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| BLK              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| HSP              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| MUL              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| WHT              | 93                                    |                          |   |   |
| FRL              | 91                                    |                          |   |   |

|                                    | 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Federal Subgroup Points Index |                                    | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWD                                | 48                                 |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC                                |                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT                                | 68                                 |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL                                | 69                                 |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 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<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2021-22 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2021-22 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 85   |        |                | 93           |            |                    | 100         |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| SWD             | 85   |        |                | 85           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         | 3                         |                 |
| ELL             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| MUL             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             | 84   |        |                | 92           |            |                    | 100         |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |
| FRL             | 76   |        |                | 88           |            |                    | 100         |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |

|                 |             |        | 2021-2         | 2 ACCOU      | NTABILIT   | Y COMPO            | NENTS BY    | SUBGRO  | UPS          |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 76          | 64     | 44             | 77           | 81         | 53                 | 84          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| SWD             | 33          | 57     | 50             | 43           | 57         |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ELL             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| AMI             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| MUL             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             | 76          | 63     | 44             | 78           | 81         | 53                 | 84          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| FRL             | 67          | 70     | 55             | 64           | 79         |                    | 81          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |

|                 |             |        | 2020-2         | 1 ACCOU      | NTABILIT   | Y COMPO            | NENTS BY    | SUBGRO  | UPS          |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 78          | 58     |                | 70           | 46         |                    | 75          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| SWD             | 25          |        |                | 44           |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ELL             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| AMI             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| MUL             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC             |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             | 81          | 67     |                | 72           | 56         |                    | 73          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| FRL             | 74          |        |                | 65           |            |                    | 70          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |

## 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 74%    | 53%      | 21%                               | 54%   | 20%                            |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 85%    | 57%      | 28%                               | 58%   | 27%                            |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 96%    | 53%      | 43%                               | 50%   | 46%                            |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 100%   | 57%      | 43%                               | 59%   | 41%                            |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 88%    | 59%      | 29%                               | 61%   | 27%                            |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 86%    | 55%      | 31%                               | 55%   | 31%                            |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 97%    | 61%      | 36%                               | 51%   | 46%                            |  |

# 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 ELA data had the lowest performance at 87%. Our contributing factors to this performance data according to our classroom walkthroughs showed a trend of lower level questioning, and a low occurrence of student to student interaction and collaboration.

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

In each of the overall achievement areas, our school experienced growth from the prior year. When looking at individual grade levels, our greatest decline from the previous year was in 5th grade ELA. In 21-22 our 5th grade ELA was at 78% proficient. This was a decline of 4% from the previous year.

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, in each achievement area, we exceeded the state proficiency. After further investigation, we found that the smallest gap between our school and the state was in 5th grade ELA. We outperformed the state by 20% in 5th grade ELA, where in 4th and 3rd grade ELA, we outperformed

the state by 27% and 46% respectively. A contributing factor for this would be teacher knowledge of benchmarks including the rigor and depth of questioning.

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

According to PM3 data, our overall math achievement showed the greatest improvement. In the prior year, 21-22 was 77% proficient. In the current year, overall math achievement was 94%. When examining individual grade level growth, 3rd grade math showed the most improvement from 21-22 to 22-23 growing from 73% to 100% (an increase of 27%)

New Actions and contributing factors for this growth was coaching support during math intervention in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade. Another action that was taken was when benchmark aligned questions and tasks were developed and used during small group instruction in 3rd grade mathematics.

Finally, additional resources were purchased to utilize during our before and after school tutoring program. Our tutoring program proved to be successful as we were able to tutor over 30% of our student population.

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

After analyzing our EWS data from Part I, one potential area of concern is attendance. 14% of our students missed 10% or more days throughout the school year.

# 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

Knowledge of depth/rigor of benchmark

Questioning

Coaching

A trend that has been identified is the need to provide ongoing motoring 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 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.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to benchmark aligned instruction is an area of need. After analyzing our classroom walkthrough data, there is a need for increased student to student interaction, and collaboration. This was evident in 83% of our classroom walks. Classroom walkthrough data also indicates that appropriate questioning and discussion was occurring in 80% of the walks, and evidence of instructional adjustment was occurring in 80% of classrooms during walks. This is compared to our other areas of focus such as pacing, engagement and rigor where the occurrence was evident in 90% or more of classrooms. Quantitatively speaking, ELA was our lowest percentage of proficiency. Increased evidence of "look for's" during classroom walkthroughs can result in higher student achievement in common district assessments and state assessments.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

#### Student Practice

By February 2024,(after the administration of PM 1 and PM 2) 75% of students in our 3rd-5th grade will be able to score proficient or higher on our district and state assessments.

By May of 2024, 90% of our students in 3rd-5th grade reaching proficiency on the state ELA Assessment.

#### **Teacher Practice**

By December of 2023, 90% of k-5 classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark aligned instruction through questioning, student to student interaction and instructional adjustments as evident by classroom walkthrough data.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

#### Student Practice:

Student data will be disaggregated after PM 1 and PM 2 data to analyze growth and trends.

#### Teacher Practice:

School leadership team will be present for collaborative planning opportunities, provide support and feedback to teachers as they prepare to deliver instruction. Instructional coach will support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned. School leadership team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery on instruction and transfer back to common planning. Leadership team will meet weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction, review coaching logs, and trend data.

#### Coaching Practice:

Administration and coaches 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:

Carlos Scott (cmscott@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.)

The following programs may be utilized to address deficits and/or provide systemic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics and sight words.

- -Benchmark Advance Phonics Kit
- -Stepping Stones to Literacy
- -Kilpatrick's One Minute PA Activities
- -Heggerty Phonemic Awareness
- -Learning Letter Names
- -UFLI

In grades 3-5 Magnetic Reading and i-Ready close reads will be utilized to enhance tier one instruction, and enrich students that scored a level 4-5 on FAST in 22-23.

Providing Professional Development: This will be done by providing time to collaborate and plan with grade level alike teams on a weekly basis in PLC's. These intensive teacher professional learning sessions will be facilitated by our school based coach and will be designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark aligned instruction and tasks as well as build capacity among staff.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Analysis of our PM 3 data indicates a need for strong, systemic foundational skills in k-2 and focused detailed, explicit instruction in comprehension for grades 3-5. These intervention strategies are research based, and are on the district wide intervention and acceleration plan.

Additionally, 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 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.

Coaching support will be provided based on walkthrough data focusing on the four "look for's" including benchmark aligned instruction.

Evidence of Implementation:

Tiered coaching support plan developed with walkthrough trends.

Coaching schedule indicating focus, frequency, and methods of support

Coaching logs documenting support and next steps.

Evidence of Impact:

Trends over time showing:

Improvement in walkthrough data of identified teachers over time
Adjustments to tiering document based on growth in teacher practice
Principal evaluation noting improvement in identified areas as evidence of coaching impact.

Person Responsible: Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Weekly monitoring during PLC's and Instructional Leadership Meetings. Bi-Annually through the Stock-Take Process. Bi-Monthly through faculty meetings. Monthly during SAC meetings.

#### #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.

After analysis and desegregation of data from the 22-23 School Year, our Early Warning System Indicates that our two highest indicators are attendance (with 31 or 13.5% of our students missing 10% or more school days) and students with one or more suspension (6 students). This indicates that the School Leadership Team can benefit from action step implementation to increase attendance and decrease the amount of office referrals.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

For Attendance: Coronado will decrease the amount of students with excessive absences to 25 students (or 11%) by May 2024.

For Discipline/to reduce the number of students with one or more suspensions: Coronado will decrease the amount of students receiving one or more suspensions from 6 to 4.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

#### Student Practice:

EWS targeted student data: These students will show a decrease in suspensions, resulting in less students with excessive suspensions compared with prior year school trends.

EWS targeted student data: These students will show a decrease in absences, resulting in less students with excessive absences compared with prior year school trends.

#### Teacher Practice:

School attendance will be taken daily.

Teachers will engage in regular parent contact if absences or referrals become concerning. Attendance and discipline data will be analyzed during monthly PBIS meetings, as well as during our bimonthly SIP focused faculty meetings.

#### Coaching Practice:

Our school based coach will support teachers and staff through PLC's and common planning on engagement strategies.

Our school based coach will collaborate with our school counselor brainstorming new attendance initiatives and incentives resulting in student success.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Quigley (kaquigle@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.)

There will be a leveled incentive system created to boost attendance

Teachers will be encouraged to facilitate Student Data Chats that review their attendance and how it affects academic performance.

Students that receive discipline referrals will engage in Restorative Practices with TOA. This will allow students to reflect on their choices and plan for future positive decision making.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's research shows that clear goal intentions have a positive effect size of .48. This will be reflective in our evidence based intervention of student data chats and restorative practices.

Hattie's research also shows that the average effect size of regular attendance is .40. This will be reflective in out evidence based intervention of boosting schoolwide attendance initiatives.

#### 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.

SLT will create an updated leveled attendance incentive system that will include student recognition on a monthly basis. These incentives will also include solicitation of student voice so that they are strategically designed to be motivational for students and parents.

Person Responsible: Jessica Canfield (jkcanfie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** These action steps will be monitored and reported to SLT members and SAC members on a monthly basis.

In order to achieve our goal for the reduction of students with more than one referral, we will continue to implement our schoolwide PBIS system including pirate bucks, and pirate points for individual and class wide positive behavior, and a weekly opportunity to visit "Treasure Island".

**Person Responsible:** Kim Quigley (kaquigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** These action steps will be monitored and reported to SLT members and SAC members on a monthly basis.

We will be implementing a refreshed restorative practices/think sheet/choice making system when addressing behaviors resulting in referrals or student conferences. This system will encourage students to set behavioral goals, and hold them accountable for future decisions or choices that are made.

**Person Responsible:** Kim Quigley (kaguigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** These action steps will be monitored and reported to SLT members and SAC members on a monthly basis.

#### 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).

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently identified as an ATSI, TSI or CSI school.

# 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

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

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

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

#### 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**

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

#### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

#### 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.

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

#### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

#### **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?

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

#### 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?

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

#### **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** 

Coronado Beach Elementary is not currently a RAISE school

# 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.

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

#### 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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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).

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

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))

Coronado Beach Elementary does not currently hold Title One Status

# **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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction  |        |  |  |
|---|--------|---|--------|--|--|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$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.

Yes