
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

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

McInnis staff, students, and community work together to encourage life-long learning in order to achieve our goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McInnis Elementary ensures academic excellence by motivating students through diverse learning experiences and celebrating individual successes.

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
Camacho, Widalis	Principal	
Garcia-Wolff, Sylvia	Assistant Principal	
Dail, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	
Barnes, Nicholas	Teacher, K-12	
Gaeta, Mari	Teacher, ESE	
Lambus, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Our process of involving stakeholders in our SIP development process is done through administration, academic coaches and teachers working together to analyze data and develop a plan. This plan and data is presented to our School Advisory Council to be reviewed and discussed before final submission. All stakeholder's input is taken into consideration to develop our SIP.

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))

McInnis Elementary's SIP will be monitored through multiple processes to ensure the plan is showing continuous improvement. Teaching and learning will be monitored through classroom walk throughs by our leadership team. We will also identify teacher support tiers for continuous coaching cycles. Student

data will be monitored and reviewed during PLC with teachers, coaches and administrators. Teachers will also participate in collaborative planning to ensure the benchmark alignment of teaching and learning. Leadership meetings will occur weekly to revisit our progress towards our SIP and review walk through data. Student data will also be shared and reviewed during grade level PLC's as Progress Monitoring assessments happen throughout the year. Our data and SIP will be shared quarterly with our School Advisory Council.

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	62%
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	20	19	11	17	14	21	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	5	0	1	1	11	8	0	0	0	26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	10	1	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	20	35	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	18	35	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	11	14	13	13	10	0	0	0	77

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	8	5	5	12	13	19	0	0	0	62

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	1	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	24	7	15	10	19	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	35	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	14	35	0	0	0	56
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	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	1	0	0	6	8	10	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	24	7	15	10	19	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	35	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	14	35	0	0	0	56
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	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	1	0	0	6	8	10	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	36	52	53	39	53	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				56			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			33		
Math Achievement*	43	55	59	47	42	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				52			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			38		
Science Achievement*	51	62	54	56	55	59	43		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	60	59	42			55		

* 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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	228
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	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	1
ELL	30	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	41			

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	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	44			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

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	36			43			51					61
SWD	10			17			21				5	40
ELL	16			29			28				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	27			35			38				5	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			53			71				4	
FRL	31			42			42				5	59

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	39	56	60	47	52	48	56					42
SWD	13	50	64	20	47	50	32					30
ELL	19	48	54	31	44	52	32					42
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP	26	50	52	37	45	55	45					41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	63		58	57	33	67					
FRL	36	53	57	46	51	48	53					41

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	36	47	33	50	65	38	43					55
SWD	6	28		17	56		36					56
ELL	16	31		37	59		34					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	26	41		45	66		43					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	56		58	63		41					
FRL	31	44	27	47	63	33	40					55

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	57%	-19%	58%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	57%	3%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	59%	-24%	61%	-26%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	51%	0%

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.

The lowest performing areas were in 3rd grade ELA (35% proficiency) and 4th grade math (35% proficiency). Contributing factors in ELA include alignment of task to benchmark and teacher knowledge of grade level benchmarks. Contributing factors in math include change in teacher midyear and teacher knowledge of grade level benchmarks. 4th grade is departmentalized so this change in teacher impacted every 4th grade student. In addition, math was not an area of focus last year and there was a change in administration mid-year.

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

The greatest decline occurred with the 4th grade cohort in math proficiency decreasing from 43% in 3rd grade (21-22) to 35% in 4th grade (22-23). This is currently our 5th grade cohort. Contributing factors include change in teacher mid-year and teacher knowledge of grade level benchmarks. 4th grade is departmentalized so this change in teacher impacted every 4th grade student. In addition, math was not an area of focus and there was a change in administration mid-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.

4th grade math (35% proficiency) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (61% proficiency). Contributing factors include change in teacher midyear and teacher knowledge of grade level benchmarks. 4th grade is departmentalized so this change in teacher impacted every 4th grade student. In addition, math was not an area of focus and there was a change in administration mid-year.

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

3rd grade Math showed the most improvement increasing from 43% proficiency to 60% proficiency. Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) was implemented in the area of math in 3rd grade. Spiral reviews were also used throughout the school year. In addition, 3rd grade collaboratively planned regularly to ensure benchmark and task alignment.

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

Our substantial reading deficiency is an area of concern with 56 students. Attendance is also an area of concern with 76 students having attendance below 90%.

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

1. Benchmark aligned instruction through collaborative planning for all subjects
2. PBIS implementation

Area of Focus

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

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

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

At McInnis Elementary, our data indicates that instruction and task have not been fully aligned to the depth of the benchmarks in all subject areas. There is work we need to do through collaborative planning to strengthen our knowledge of the benchmarks in an effort to improve tier 1 instruction and increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Practice:

After administration of PM1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with district trends. By January of 2024, 50% of students will show proficiency on the ELA and Math VBAs. 62% of 5th grade students will show proficiency on the Science VBA.

Teacher Practice:

By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with Benchmark-aligned tasks 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, PM2, VBA 1, and VBA2 and compared to district proficiency and growth trends.

50% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each VBA is administered, teacher, with the support of coach will track data to make instructional decisions.

Teacher Practice:

Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly. Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor look-fors. Stocktake meetings will occur two times throughout the school year to identify focus areas and develop specific action steps to address each one.

Coaching Practice:

Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments and plan for professional development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC.

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 level teams will plan for aligned instruction to target benchmarks based on disaggregated data after VBAs and PMs.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Dail (rndail@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023 - PM1 October 2023 - VBA 1 December - VBA2 January 2024 - PM2 March 2024- VBA3

Administration and coach will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the schoolwide “look fors.” Coach will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Dail (rndail@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Plan and provide professional development opportunities based on look fors and staff needs.

1. questioning and collaborative structures
2. scaffolds and supports for ELLs and SWDs
3. science collaborative planning focused on the nature of science
4. data analysis of VBA3 to plan for instruction

Person Responsible: Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#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.

At McInnis Elementary, we have had inconsistencies with schoolwide expectations and an increase in discipline referrals. There is work we need to do on defining and strengthening schoolwide expectations in an effort to decrease behavior concerns.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student practice:

Discipline referrals will decrease by 25% by the end of the school year.

100% of students will be able to state the 3 PBIS expectations - Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Safe

Teacher practice:

100% of teachers will have the PBIS expectations posted in their classroom and refer to them.

Discipline referrals will decrease by 25% by the end of the school year due to implementation of behavior strategies.

Coaching practice:

Frequency of behavior coaching support will decrease by 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

Quarterly behavior meetings will take place with coach, administration, behavior specialist, teacher, etc to monitor discipline data and provide strategies and next steps for tier 2-3 students.

Teacher Practice:

PBIS Team will provide expectations to all teachers and lesson plans for teaching expectations.

Implementation will be monitored through PBIS walkthroughs.

Coaching practice:

Coach will track teachers needing behavior support and discuss at weekly coach/admin PLC.

PBIS Team will meet monthly to discuss trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@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.)

Reducing child problem behaviors and improving teacher-child interactions and relationships. This is identified as a Tier 1 intervention identified by WWC.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By reducing child problem behaviors and improving teacher-child interactions and relationships, the number of discipline referrals will decrease and student achievement will increase.

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.

Develop a PBIS handbook and professional development opportunity outlining schoolwide expectations.

Person Responsible: Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Train teachers on the new PBIS expectations, provide classroom signage, and PBIS handbook.

Person Responsible: Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Conduct weekly PBIS walkthroughs with specific look fors each week.

Person Responsible: Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Conduct monthly PBIS Team meetings to discuss progress and plan coaching opportunities and next steps.

Person Responsible: Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

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).

Title I funds were allocated last school year by the pervious administration based on need. Funds were allocated for an intervention teacher, two paraprofessionals, intervention materials, learning walks, and tutoring. After reviewing FAST data, the current administration was able to make a few amendments by allocating additional funds for intervention materials in an effort to provide individualized instruction that is aligned to the benchmarks to our tier 2 and 3 students and increase overall ELA proficiency.

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

In grades K-2, we will focus on ELA benchmark aligned instruction. Through PLCs and collaborative planning, teachers will gain a solid understanding of the ELA benchmarks they are teaching and collaboratively plan focused instruction to meet the needs of their students.

The Early Literacy or Star Reading data used to determine this critical need is listed below.

45% of students in Kindergarten scored below 40th percentile

56% of students in 1st grade scored below 40th percentile

48% of students in 2nd grade scored below the 40th percentile

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

In grades 3-5, we will focus on ELA benchmark aligned instruction. Through PLCs and collaborative planning, teachers will gain a solid understanding of the ELA benchmarks they are teaching and collaboratively plan focused instruction to meet the needs of their students. This was identified as a critical need because our PM3 data indicated that only 42% of our 3rd-5th grade students were proficient on the ELA PM3. Therefore, 58% of students scored below a level 3.

Additional FAST ELA data used to determine this critical need is listed below.

63% of students in 3rd scored below 40th percentile

59% of students in 4th grade scored below 40th percentile

53% of students in 5th grade scored below the 40th percentile

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

After administration of the ELA PM1 and PM2, all students in grades K-2 will show growth consistent with district trends.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

After administration of the ELA PM1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with district trends.

By January of 2024, 50% of students will show proficiency on the ELA VBAs.

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.

Student Practice:

Student data will be disaggregated after PM1, PM2, VBA 1, and VBA2 and compared to district proficiency and growth trends.

50% proficiency will be the common goal in ELA for the 23-24 school year. After each VBA is administered, teacher, with the support of coach will track data to make instructional decisions.

Teacher Practice:

Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.

Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor look-fors.

Stocktake meetings will occur two times throughout the school year to identify focus areas and develop specific action steps to address each one.

Coaching Practice:

Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments and plan for professional development.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Camacho, Widalis, wcamacho@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?

Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning focused on the B.E.S.T. ELA standards, facilitated by school based experts (coach) and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff.

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?

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

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC and will help increase student achievement in ELA.

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
Our literacy leadership team consisting of our academic coach, principal, assistant principal, and reading intervention teacher will work together to support our grade level teams as they plan for aligned instruction to target benchmarks based on disaggregated data after completing the VBA and Progress Monitoring Assessments.	Camacho, Widalis, wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us
Administration and coach will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the schoolwide “look fors.” Coach will provide literacy coaching based on walkthrough data.	Camacho, Widalis, wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional learning will be provided throughout the year on the following topics.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. questioning and collaborative structures 2. scaffolds and supports for ELLs and SWDs 3. science collaborative planning focused on the nature of science 4. data analysis of VBA3 to plan for instruction 	Camacho, Widalis, wcamacho@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.

Our SIP will be shared with our faculty during preplanning and will be shared and reviewed monthly with our School Leadership Team and School Advisory Committee. The SIP will also be available to all stakeholders through our school website.

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))

Parent-Teacher Conferences:

Organize regular parent-teacher conferences to discuss students' academic progress, strengths, and areas for improvement. Create a comfortable environment for parents to ask questions, share insights, and collaborate with teachers on strategies for their child's success.

Family Engagement Events:

Host family-focused events that empower parents with tools to support their child's learning at home. Incorporate cultural and community-based activities to foster a sense of belonging.

Parent Involvement in Decision-Making:

Encourage parents and community stakeholders to actively participate in our SAC and PTA. Seek input on school policies, programs, and initiatives to ensure diverse perspectives are considered.

Volunteer Opportunities:

Provide opportunities for parents and community members to volunteer in classrooms, school events, and extracurricular activities.

Community Partnerships:

Collaborate with local businesses and organizations to provide additional resources and opportunities for students and families.

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)

Tutoring:

3rd-5th grade ELA tutoring will be offered in both the Fall and Spring for a total of 18 weeks. Students will be selected to participate based on PM and VBA data.

Boot Camps:

Saturday Boot Camps will take place for 3rd-5th grade students in the month of April/May. Students will work on ELA, math, and science learning activities determined by assessment data.

Collaborative Planning:

Collaborative planning opportunities were provided during the summer for math instruction. Collaborative planning will also take place throughout the school year by all grade levels in all subject areas using the district wide look fors as a guide to focus on benchmark aligned instruction, benchmark aligned tasks, questioning to deepen understanding, and collaborative structures.

Walk to Intervention:

ELA Walk to Intervention will begin schoolwide on September 5 using data from last school year. WTI groups will be adjusted regularly using PM and VBA data. K-2 will use SIPPS and 3rd-5th will use SIPPS, Measuring Up, and Magnetic lessons.

Small Group Instruction:

The Being a Reader program will be implemented in grade K-2 for small group instruction. Grades 3-5 will use the new Benchmark small group lessons and Magnetic lessons to differentiate instruction.

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

N/A

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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	\$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