

Volusia County Schools

R. J. Longstreet Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

R. J. Longstreet Elementary School

2745 S PENINSULA DR, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

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

R. J. Longstreet, in partnership with our community, will empower students to become compassionate, lifelong learners who are responsible, productive and engaged citizens within our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students strive to achieve their maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring and challenging learning environment.

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
Bruner, Lynn	Principal	Instructional leader that monitors SIP goals throughout the year.
Henderson, Marge	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader that monitors SIP goals throughout the year.
Legath, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Coaching teachers based on tier levels as it aligns to SIP goals.
Johnston, Jennifer	Other	To teach and monitor all ELL students as aligned to our SIP goals.
Palmore, Shana	Other	Intervention teacher to monitor and teach students to align to our SIP goals.
Rajcooar, Christina	Teacher, K-12	To ELA and Math to our 5th grade students.

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 primary process for involving our stakeholders is at our monthly SAC meetings. Input is recorded in minutes that is then used to help develop our SIP. To make sure we reach all stakeholders principal callouts, newsletters, family engagement events, and climate surveys. This allows for all stakeholders to have a say in the SIP development.

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))

This will be conducted during grade level weekly PLC meetings. Data will be discussed on all students with a primary focus on our ESSA groups. FAST data and district assessments will be used and discussed during PLC to make sure students are successful. If a SIP goal is not being met, discussions will take place on how to improve and what additional intervention a student is in need of.

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	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	20	14	16	19	14	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	7	4	5	7	6	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	7	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	4	57	2	2	0	0	0	67	

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	1	4	3	24	7	15	0	0	0	54

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	1	3	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	14
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										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	23	18	23	13	13	10	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	2	2	6	6	6	4	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	9	6	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	12	13	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	14	8	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	18	9	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	11	16	9	6	3	0	0	0	51	

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	4	5	8	24	17	14	0	0	0	72

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	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	23	18	23	13	13	10	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	2	2	6	6	6	4	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	9	6	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	12	13	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	14	8	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	18	9	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	11	16	9	6	3	0	0	0	51	

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	4	5	8	24	17	14	0	0	0	72

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	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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*	58	52	53	55	53	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				71			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57					
Math Achievement*	62	55	59	54	42	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				67			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57					
Science Achievement*	65	62	54	74	55	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	60	59	52			65		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
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	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	23	Yes	4	3
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	63			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	54			

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	27	Yes	3	2
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	57			

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	58			62			65					65
SWD	17			34							3	
ELL	31			56							3	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			36							2	
HSP	54			64							4	62
MUL	58			58							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			69			78				4	
FRL	50			52			57				5	67

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	55	71	57	54	67	57	74					52
SWD	10	20		21	42	40						
ELL	40			60								52
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	35	63		39	57							
HSP	22			50								57
MUL	54			46								
PAC												
WHT	69	77	60	61	75		77					
FRL	49	67	57	48	61	55	64					52

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	59	56		62	66		74					65
SWD	33			20								
ELL												65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			52								
HSP	38			31								70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	60		73	71		83					
FRL	54	52		54	58		68					64

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	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	57%	6%	58%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	51%	11%

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 ELA data our 3rd grade students showed the lowest performance at 51.4%. Our 4th grade scored a 62.5% and our 5th grade scored a 64.4%.

Contributing factors to this were teachers new to this grade level, knowledge of the benchmark, and benchmark aligned tasks. Our ELL teacher was pulled to substitute in one of the 3rd grade classes for the last 8 weeks of the school year which prohibited ELL instruction. Coaching in ELA classrooms was limited due to scheduling conflicts.

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

According to FSSA data our 5th grade students showed a decline in performance. In 2022 5th grade scored at a 69%. In 2023 5th grade scored at a 62%.

Contributing factors to this were that the test was given 2 weeks earlier and a decrease in science intervention push-in. In 2022, we had a science intervention teacher funded privately that would push-in the classroom 4 times a week. In 2023, we did not have this same position.

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.

3rd grade math has 8% less proficiency than the state average.
Contributing factor to this is a change in benchmarks from 2022 to 2023.

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

According to PM3 data, our 4th grade math data has the greatest increase in improvement from 50% to 76%.

Actions that contributed to this was an increase of very focused and consistent math intervention. Donations from the community allowed for us to hire 2 additional intervention teachers to focus on math intervention up until PM3. After-school collaborative math planning allowed for in depth intentionally planning to develop benchmark aligned tasks.

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

Attendance continues to be an area of concern, 29.7% of our student population had attendance below 90%. An additional area of concern is our students with a substantial reading deficiency with 22% of our students demonstrating this.

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

The following systems are what our attention is going to focus most on in the upcoming school year.

1. Planning
2. MTSS
3. Coaching

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 Collaborative Planning**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 R.J. Longstreet elementary, we have had consistencies with the structure, facilitation, and implementation of collaborative planning. There is work we need to do on defining and strengthening the before, during, and after collaborative structures we currently have in place, as well as coaching supports to positively impact student outcomes and teaching practices.

According to our ESSA subgroup data, a need for collaborative planning has been identified. 27% of our SWD reached proficiency across all academic areas. With an increased collaborative planning, SWD proficiency will increase on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By February 2024, 70% of 3rd - 5th grade students will be able to score a 70% on the ELA and Math district assessments. By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students standards-aligned tasks as evidence in walkthroughs.

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

70% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each benchmark aligned common assessment is administered, data will be tracked, analyzed, and charted during PLC meetings.

Teacher Practice:

Administration and/or coach will attend common planning to monitor for benchmark-aligned planning of tasks.

Coaching Practice:

Administration will collaborate with the coach as to focus on areas of instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynn Bruner (blbruner@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 bi-weekly and through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by school-based coaches and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidence by Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Professional Development Validation Study Meyers, Coby V.; Molefe, Ayrin; Brandt, W. Christopher; Zhu, Bo; Dhillon, Sonica

Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, v38 n3 p455-476 Sep 2016. Retrieved from:
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1108395>

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.

Action Step #1

Create a master schedule that allows course content specific collaborative planning to occur bi-weekly with support by administrators and academic coach. Leadership team will create a common planning protocol that defines expectations for before, during, and after planning.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Legath (jblegath@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2024

Academic coach and administration will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Legath (jblegath@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2024

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

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

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

According to EWS data, 6 of 26 (23%) students received 10 or more referrals. 18 of 26 (69%) students received an out of school suspension. According to school-wide data, we decreased in the number of referrals given. The 2021 - 2022 showed 487 referrals which dropped to 396 referrals for the 2022 - 2023 school year.

According to ESSA data, our SWD earned 178 referrals of our 396 (45%). Our AA students earned 106 of our 396 (27%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

By February 2024, our EWS students will earn less than 10 referrals.

By May 2024, our SWD referral data will reduce to 40% and our AA students will reduce to 22% of our total number of referrals given

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

Using individualized student behavior data tracking charts, students will self-reflect on each identified area of their chart.

Teacher Practice:

Provide individualized feedback as planned on their data chart. MTSS/PST implementation when status of improvement or a decline occurs.

Coaching Practice:

Providing teachers with resources (monitoring sheets), tools, and/or materials. Provide individualized feedback as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marge Henderson (mehender@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 teachers with classroom management and de-escalation strategies utilizing positive behavior intervention support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that classroom management is a factor in de-escalating children's aggressive behavior.

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidence by Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Chuang, C.-c., Reinke, W. M., & Herman, K. C. (2020). Effects of a universal classroom management teacher training program on elementary children with aggressive behaviors. *School Psychology*, 35(2), 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000351>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create individualized behavior charts that allows for specific desired behaviors to be reviewed as directed on the behavior chart.

Person Responsible: Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2024

Coach and administration will provide tools, resources, and/or materials as needed.

Person Responsible: Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 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).

School improvement funding allocations will be reviewed:

- * monthly SAC meetings
- * open house
- * monthly staff and leadership team meetings
- * family engagement nights

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

Second grade STAR ELA: 47% of students met proficiency. 53% fell below the 40th percentile showing that proficiency was not met.

Phonics, phonological awareness, and comprehension is the instructional practice targeted for reading/ELA.

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

Phonics, fluency, and comprehension is the instructional practice targeted for reading/ELA

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

50% of second grade students will meet proficiency levels on the STAR mid year assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% of the students in 3-5 will be at grade level on the Cambium mid year assessment.

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.

Grades 3-5 will review student outcomes on district assessment and plan, reteach, and create reassessments for the I&E blocks. Goal 50% of students meeting proficiency on district assessment by March 2024.

Grades K-2 will complete 4 to 6 weeks progress monitoring (reading fluency and comprehension). Goal: 50% of students will be reading on grade level by March 2024.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bruner, Lynn, blbruner@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?

Benchmark, iReady, Magnetic Reading, SIPPS, Road to the Code, Wilson, Being a Reader

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?

Benchmark and Magnetic Reading: small group instruction: Benchmark based and rigorous.

SIPPS, Road to the Code, Wilson, Being a Reader: Small group instruction. Instructional programs utilized to fill in phonics and phonemic awareness gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Benchmark-aligned small group instruction</p> <p>Leadership and Academic Coach: Complete walkthroughs and provide immediate feedback to teachers. Facilitate instructional discussions during PLCs to ensure benchmark is aligned to the curriculum map, instruction being delivered, student work and teacher questions.</p> <p>Assessment: 4 to 6 weeks checks (fluency, comprehension, and phonics) Goal: 50% of students reading on grade level by March 2024.</p> <p>Professional Learning: If needed</p>	<p>Bruner, Lynn, blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Walk to Intervention with benchmark-aligned small group instruction.</p> <p>Leadership and Academic Coach: Walkthroughs and instructional feedback. Facilitate instructional discussions during PLCs to ensure benchmark is aligned to curriculum map, instruction being delivered, student work and teacher questions.</p> <p>Assessment: After content is retaught, students will be assessed. Goal: 70% of students retested will demonstrate proficiency.</p> <p>Professional Learning: If needed</p>	<p>Bruner, Lynn, blbruner@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

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

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

Methods for dissemination of the SIP:

- * SAC
- * Open House
- * Faculty Meetings
- * Social Media
- * School Marquee
- * 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))

How to build positive relationships:

- * School Website
- * Connect-Ed
- * Social Media
- * Sunday evening message from the principal
- * School functions

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))

Through collaborative planning, professional development, weekly PLCs, coaching, and mentoring.

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
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.

No