

Volusia County Schools

Westside Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Westside Elementary School

1700 5TH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

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

Parents, staff, students, and community members will work together to provide quality educational programs that focus on the total development of the child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Copeland, Dwayne	Principal	
Glenn-Dixon, Tamla	Assistant Principal	
Harvard, Tamika	Math Coach	
Schwab, Theresa	Instructional Coach	
Whipple, Zanetta	Instructional Coach	
Dhawan, Kymberli	Other	
Maltoni, Lisa	School Counselor	
Pena, Michelle	Science Coach	

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 School Leadership Team (SLT) utilized the Spring 2023 Climate Survey results to gain input from all stakeholders (students, parents, community members, faculty, and staff members) in the development of the 2023-24 School Improvement Plan. Input was obtained in the following ways:

- 3rd-5th Grade students - Media special area rotations
- Parents, Families, and Community Members - QR codes were sent home, flyers were passed out at the parent pick up loop, flyers were also shared at PTA and SAC meetings, QR codes were placed on tables during our 4th quarter awards assemblies for all grade levels, Links/QR codes went on school website and social media.
- Faculty/Staff members - completed surveys during our April Faculty Meeting

The SLT also used the FAST PM3 Assessment data to create goals and areas of focus for 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))

The SIP will be monitored monthly during School Leadership Team Meetings. During this time the team will: -

- discuss progress toward our goals
- review action steps, how the actionable steps are being monitored, what are the next steps, and who is responsible
- what PLs are needed to support teachers and increase student achievement
- how is feedback being provided and monitored
- monitor subgroups to determine effectiveness of supports in place

STOCKTAKE Process

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	87%
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: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D

	2017-18: D
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	11	45	41	53	23	31	0	0	0	204	
One or more suspensions	1	8	16	37	16	27	0	0	0	105	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	18	16	16	0	0	0	50	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	11	17	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	39	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	41	0	0	0	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	38	

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	2	7	26	22	38	0	0	0	96

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

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	53	32	38	39	36	45	0	0	0	243	
One or more suspensions	12	15	20	31	17	31	0	0	0	126	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	40	15	15	0	0	0	70	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	14	1	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	52	45	54	0	0	0	151	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	54	36	59	0	0	0	149	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	11	24	24	16	52	0	0	0	134	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	10	11	22	55	35	58	0	0	0	191

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	8
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										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	53	32	38	39	36	45	0	0	0	243	
One or more suspensions	12	15	20	31	17	31	0	0	0	126	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	40	15	15	0	0	0	70	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	14	1	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	52	45	54	0	0	0	151	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	54	36	59	0	0	0	149	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	11	24	24	16	52	0	0	0	134	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	10	11	22	55	35	58	0	0	0	191

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	8
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.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	52	53	32	53	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				49			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			41		
Math Achievement*	33	55	59	32	42	50	31		
Math Learning Gains				52			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			41		
Science Achievement*	51	62	54	32	55	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	60	59	53			43		

* 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	11	Yes	4	4
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	4	
HSP	47			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	37	Yes	1	

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%
FRL	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%
SWD	28	Yes	3	3
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	3	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	42			

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	39			33			51					50
SWD	7			7			23				4	
ELL	42			42			20				4	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			28			45				4	
HSP	45			42			55				4	45
MUL	50			50							3	

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
PAC												
WHT	44			38							3	
FRL	39			32			51				5	52

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	32	49	40	32	52	48	32					53
SWD	12	34	31	18	38	43	21					
ELL	6	27	20	18	47							53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	49	41	26	50	41	27					
HSP	26	47	33	33	47		25					53
MUL	31			38								
PAC												
WHT	49	67		54	62		60					
FRL	30	48	41	30	53	50	31					53

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	27	39	41	31	33	41	38					43
SWD	8	40		8	33		0					
ELL	5	20		14	40							43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	42	60	26	36		44					
HSP	25	31		31	38							45
MUL	27			45								
PAC												
WHT	40	42		39	25		25					
FRL	26	39	44	30	32	41	38					53

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	36%	53%	-17%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	57%	-20%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	24%	55%	-31%	55%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	61%	-14%	51%	-4%

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 data component that showed the lowest performance is 5th Grade Math Proficiency.

Contributing Factors: We had a vacancy on the 5th grade team. In addition, Coaching support was not consistent, as Coaches were covering other vacancies in other grade levels. Based on previous FSA and current FAST PM3 data, departmentalizing in 5th grade could also be a contributing factor.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is 5th Grade Math Proficiency.

Contributing Factors: We had a vacancy on the 5th grade team. In addition, Coaching support was not consistent, as Coaches were covering other vacancies in other grade levels. Based on previous FSA and current FAST PM3 data, departmentalizing in 5th grade could also be a contributing factor.

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 the FAST PM3 assessment data, our 5th grade Math data had the greatest gap when compared to the state. The state average was 55% and our average was 24%. This gives us a difference of 31%.

Contributing Factors: We had a vacancy on the 5th grade team and the team was departmentalized, in which 2 teachers were responsible for the Math instruction of all 4 units. In addition, there were some changes to what portions of Math lessons were taught by the two teachers.

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

According to the State Science Assessment data, our 5th grade science data had the highest increase. From 2021-2022 to 2022-2023, our 5th graders increased proficiency from 32% to 47%.

New Actions: Our Science Interventionist increased the amount of support provided to the 5th grade students. The Science block was extended to provide more learning time for students. Academic incentives were purchased, using grant funds, to increase motivation and engagement. PENDA and

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

According to our school's EWS data, two major areas of concern are attendance and the number of students with substantial reading deficiencies.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming year are in the areas of Planning for Core Instruction and Coaching Support.

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.

According to our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that 40% of our students reached proficiency in ELA, 34% in Math, and 47% in Science which are below the state average. Our analysis also revealed that 37% of our instructional staff is either new to teaching or new to the grade level.

With an increased focus on collaborative planning practices, student 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.

Student Practice: After administration of PM1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with district growth trends. By January 2024, 45% of students in 3rd-5th grade groups will be able to score a 70% or higher on state/district in ELA and Math common assessments and 50% of 5th grade students will be able to score a 70% or higher on state/district in Science common assessments.

Teacher Practice: By January 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice: By January 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.

The following area of focus will be monitored by:

- ELA, Math, and Science Instruction - Administrative/Learning Walks using the VCS Look-fors Tool with feedback and Coaching Support
- Quarterly Data Chats and weekly PLCs - to monitor the impact of collaborative planning on instruction

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@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.)

Student Practice:

- Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to district proficiency and growth trends.
- 45% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each benchmark-aligned common assessment is administered, teachers, with the support of coaches will tach and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practice:

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

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.

- Coaches will share coaching plans / notes to Administration so they may provide feedback to instructional coaches.

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 evidenced by Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Professional development Validation Study Meyers, Coby V.; Molefe, Aydin; Brandt, W. Christopher; Zhu, Bo; Dhillon, Sonica (2016). Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, v38 n3 p455-476. 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: Create a master schedule that allows grade level or course content specific collaborative planning/PLCs to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coaches. Leadership team will create a common planning protocol that defines expectations for before, during, and after planning.

Evidence: Master schedule, completed planning protocols, Administrative feedback/notes from planning, aligned lesson plans

Evidence of Impact: Trends over time showing an increase in:

- Teachers providing aligned tasks.
- Teachers modeling application of intended learning.
- Teachers questioning to deepen understanding.
- Teacher's use of academic language.
- Student application of intended learning to complete a task.
- Student use of academic language.

Person Responsible: Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023

Action Step: Coaches will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Evidence:

- 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:

- 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: Dwayne Copeland (dcopelan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024 (ongoing)

#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.

According to our Needs Assessment Analysis, it revealed that 21% of our students received 2 or more discipline referrals during the 2022-2023 school year. Our analysis also revealed that 37% of our instructional staff is either new to teaching or new to their current grade level.

With an increased focus on positive behavioral interventions, the number of discipline referrals will decrease. .

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Practice: By January 2024, the number of referrals written will decrease to 18% from 21% as evidenced by our Early Warning System data.

Teacher Practice: By January 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with positive behavioral interventions as evidenced by our PBIS Intervention documentation.

Coaching Practice: By January 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support in classroom management will decrease by 85%.

Monitoring:

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

The following area of focus will be monitored by:

- Weekly SLT Meetings - specifically identifying the supports needed for teachers that are writing referrals, as well as the students receiving them.
- SEL Walks at the midpoint and end of each quarter - Using CHAMPS STOIC Charlotte Danielson Crosswalk Look fors document.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kymberli Dhawan (kkdhawan@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.)

Student Practice:

- Discipline data will be disaggregated at the midpoint and end of each quarter.
- Decreasing the number of discipline referrals by 3% will be the the 23-24 school year.

Teacher Practice:

- Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed.
- SEL TOA will support during this process, as well as, throughout the MTSS/iPST process.

Coaching Practice:

- Administration and SEL TOA will meet weekly as a team to analyze the discipline and referral data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.
- SEL TOA will share plans for support / notes to Administration so they may provide feedback to teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that PBIS has had positive effects on 15% of students initially identified as struggling with behavior. In addition, providing students with positive behavioral interventions and supports has also increased student achievement.

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidenced 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 (2016). Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, v38 n3 p455-476. 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: Refine our current PBIS structure to support teachers and students with Tier II and III needs.

Evidence: Discipline data, PBIS Tracking sheets, report cards, Administrative/SEL walks with feedback/ notes

Evidence of Impact: Trends over time:

- decrease in the number of discipline referrals written
- decrease in the need classroom management support
- increase in proactive and restorative practices used by teachers in the classroom

Person Responsible: Kymberli Dhawan (kkdhawan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024 (ongoing)

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).

By conducting a Needs Assessment we review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs.

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

As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed the following Proficiency Data by Grade Level:

Kindergarten - TBD

1st Grade - 37%

2nd Grade - 59%

This is based on ELA 2022-2023 Renaissance state assessment.

Additionally, data from our school-level walkthroughs indicate a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to grade-level foundational skills.

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

As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency is 40%.

Based on ELA 2023 FAST PM3 assessment data for students currently in 3rd grade 54%, 4th grade 58% and 5th grade 59% of students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

Additionally, walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment data.

By January 2024, 60% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned assessments.
 By May 2024, 80% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs. By May 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment data.

By January 2024, 40% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned assessments.

By May 2024, 85% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.

By May 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

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.

The following will be monitored:

- ELA Instruction - Administrative/Learning Walks with feedback, Coaching Support
- Data Chats (district assessments) to frequently monitor the impact of core instruction

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Schwab, Theresa, tlschwa1@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?

Evidence-based practices/programs being implemented are ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum aligned to the BEST Standards, SIPPS in K-4 to address foundational skills, daily small group differentiated instruction utilizing ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum to also include the intervention and enrichment toolkit. Additionally, collaborative planning with grade level teams utilizing a planning protocol.

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?

We will use the district approved ELA resources and curriculum for core instruction as well as interventions. These resources address the identified need and have a record for effectiveness of our population per the district.

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>ELA Collaborative Planning with grade level teams to include support teachers, administration, academic coach, and regional resource teachers. Academic Coach and regional resource teacher in order to ensure that instruction and students tasks are aligned to the benchmark.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching team, including District Transformation Resource Teachers, will facilitate Collaborative Planning using the ELA Planning Protocol. Formative and summative assessment data will be considered during planning.</p>	<p>Whipple , Zanetta , zswhippl@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and School Leadership Team Meetings. Academic Coaches, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and 3 students through progress monitoring will occur and instructional decisions made to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>Schwab, Theresa, tlschwa1@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Select teachers will participate in ongoing tier 1 and tier 2 level coaching support in ELA with the academic coaches. This support will include observations, feedback, modeling, lesson planning, assessment review, and as appropriate mini professional learning sessions.</p>	<p>Schwab, Theresa, tlschwa1@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.

The method of dissemination of this SIP occurred during our first faculty meeting of the school, during our State of the School Address. In addition, the SIP will be shared with all stakeholders during our September SAC meeting and at Open House.

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))

Our school will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders we will create a Parent and Family Engagement Plan. In addition, we will encourage family engagement monthly during SAC Meetings. We will use our Bethune-Cookman PDS Partnership to build rapport our community stakeholders and use all school social media platforms to provide information to all stakeholders.

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)

Our school will strengthen the academic program in the school by utilizing our Instructional Coaches to ensure that teachers are actively engaging in Collaborative Planning. Teachers will be supported through Coaching Cycles using the VCS Look For Tool, specifically focusing on lesson planning and delivery.

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))

none

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))

none

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).

none

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))

none

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))

none

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: 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