

Volusia County Schools

Indian River 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	0

Indian River Elementary School

650 ROBERTS RD, Edgewater, FL 32141

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

We, the Indian River faculty, staff, students and parents respectfully encourage each other to excel with enthusiasm, excitement and energy as we responsibly explore the world around us.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Indian River Elementary School is to provide our children with educational programs of the highest value, along with related services of worth, in an environment that is safe, healthy, happy and orderly. The cooperative efforts of the family, the community and the school will guarantee to every student the opportunity to develop the knowledge and values necessary to be an informed citizen.

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
Booth, Mercedes	Instructional Coach	
Holmgreen, Jennifer	Principal	
Dowdell, Tricia	Instructional Coach	
Reilly, Carly	Teacher, K-12	
Reaves, Wendy	Assistant Principal	
Dollar, Sierra	Teacher, ESE	

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.

Data is presented to all stakeholder groups throughout the entire process. Input is sought through the use of online survey's, face to face meetings, and weekly communications.

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 throughout the year in a variety of different ways. These include classroom walk throughs, PLC discussions, and data chats. Revisions will made quarterly based most relevant data and specific areas of need.

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	19%
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)* 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: B 2018-19: B 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	12	21	32	20	16	20	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	2	3	6	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	18
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	0	2	9	0	0	0	16

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	1	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	23	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	21	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	10	7	13	15	0	0	0	50

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	0	1	2	1	5	6	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	1	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	23	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	21	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	10	7	13	15	0	0	0	50

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	0	1	2	1	5	6	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*	52	52	53	56	53	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				52			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			29		
Math Achievement*	54	55	59	61	42	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				53			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			14		
Science Achievement*	56	62	54	68	55	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	223
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
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	32	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP				
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	57			
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	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	51			

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	52			54			56					
SWD	25			25			35				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			27							2	
HSP												
MUL	41			53							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			55			59				4	
FRL	53			53			50				4	

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	56	52	45	61	53	39	68					
SWD	19	44	48	26	38	32	26					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	60	40		80	80							
PAC												
WHT	55	52	44	58	50	40	66					
FRL	54	50	46	58	52	33	67					

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	55	51	29	57	31	14	58					
SWD	19	12		22	0	0	17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	63			60								
PAC												
WHT	55	51	31	56	33	19	61					
FRL	51	47	19	54	26	6	52					

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	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	53%	9%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	57%	10%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	61%	-6%	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.

PM3 data shows our 5th grade math data had the lowest performance at 43% proficient. According to our walk through data, we have noticed that student tasks are only slightly aligned to the Benchmark standards. Additionally, many student tasks performed lacked the rigor required to acquire student success.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was 5th grade math. We had a decline of 7% (50% - 43%) from the year before. Contributing factors include pacing of new curriculum, lack of collaborative planning and a new teacher in the grade level.

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 PM 3 data, our 5th grade Math data had the greatest gap compared to the state. The state average was 55%. We were at 43% for a difference of 12%. Contributing factors include pacing of new

curriculum, lack of collaborative planning and classroom management. Additionally, the effects of hurricane Ian had a direct impact on teacher attendance.

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

According to PM3 data, 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement from 44% to 49%. Our fifth grade intervention schedule provided targeted intervention to all students.

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

Two areas of potential concern are attendance and discipline. Both areas were pretty much aligned to the prior year yet continue to be an issue at our school.

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

- 1) Planning
- 2) MTSS/Problem-Solving
- 3) Attendance Initiatives
- 4) PBIS/ Behavior Initiatives

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 IRES, we have had inconsistencies with student aligned tasks as a result of ineffective collaborative planning resulting in 57% of students reaching proficiency in ELA and 58% of students reaching proficiency in Math. Based on our ESSA subgroup data our SWD students scored 33% proficient overall. The focus of collaborative planning will be how will we address SWD needs during core instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For example, at IRES ...

Student Practice:

- After administration of PM1 and PM2, all students will show growth consistent with state growth trends.
- By February of 2024, 65% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned common assessments in ELA, Math and Science.

Teacher Practice:

- By December 2023, 80% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark - aligned tasks as evidence in walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice:

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

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

- Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.
- 65% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year. After each benchmark assessment is administered, teachers, with the support of coaches will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practice:

- Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
- Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor for 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.
- Administration will collect coaching plans/notes and provide feedback to instructional coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@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 (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.

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 a master schedule that allows grade level or course content specific collaborative planning 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.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: - Master schedule has been created and collaborative planning will begin August 29 and occur every Tuesday. - Common planning protocol will be created, shared and implemented by August 29.

Coaches will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation will begin mid September.

#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.

IRES has strongly focused on implementing PBIS throughout the 2022/23 school year. While we have seen a positive decline in student discipline/negative behavior, we still have some significant work to do. Additionally, the use of PBIS will increase engagement and confidence among our students with disabilities as well as our general education population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Practice:

- By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the total amount of student referrals will decrease 25%, from 264 to 200.

Teacher Practice:

- By November 2023, 100% of classroom teachers will implement the school wide PBIS system.

Coaching Practice:

- By January 2024, less than 10% of teachers will need intensive support with classroom management.

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

- Discipline data will be monitored and analyzed through weekly PLCs.

Teacher Practice:

- PBIS team will meet monthly with teachers needing support with implementing PBIS strategies for specific student interventions.

Coaching Practice:

- Assistant Principal will bring discipline data to weekly coaches meetings to analyze and determine need of support for teachers and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Holmgreen (jholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is a framework for supporting whole school practices to promote a safe school setting by supporting social learning behavioral and emotional needs of all students (Michigan Department of Education).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing PBIS: By implementing PBIS interventions school wide, low level classroom disruptions will decrease and student engagement 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.

PBIS professional development and refresher. PBIS team will provide monthly collaboration support.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: PBIS initial professional development was held during preplanning and refresher is March 13, 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 and resources will be used based on the needs of SWD students and reviewed with the school leadership team and school stakeholders.

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

Based on STAR PM 3 , 31% of students in kindergarten are not on track to score a level 3. (69% proficient)

Based on STAR PM 3, 34% of students in grade 1 are not on track to score a level 3. (66% proficient)

Based on STAR PM 3, 33% of students in grade 2 are not on track to score a level 3. (67% proficient)

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

Based on FAST PM 3, 40% of students in grade 3 did not meet proficiency. (60% 3 or higher)

Based on FAST PM 3, 38% of students in grade 4 did not meet proficiency. (62% 3 or higher)

Based on FAST PM 3, 51% of students in grade 5 did not meet proficiency. (49% 3 or higher)

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

Not applicable

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, the percentage of students that score a 3 or higher in grades 3- 5 on the FAST PM 3 will increase by 10%.

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 area of focus will be monitored through collaborative planning (completed planning protocols), data analysis at PLCs, and walkthrough data including feedback for continued growth.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Holmgreen, Jennifer, jlholmgr@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, ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum to also include intervention and enrichment toolkit. Additionally, collaborative planning with grade level teams utilizing a planning protocol and Test Item Specifications.

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 Magnetic intervention and other approved intervention resources. These address the identified need and have a record of effectiveness for 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>Action Step 1: ELA collaborative planning with grade level teams to include support teachers, administration, academic coaches, and regional resource teachers. Academic coach and regional support teacher will ensure that instruction and student tasks are aligned to the benchmark.</p>	<p>Holmgreen, Jennifer, jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Action Step 2: Professional learning in Magnetic Intervention will be provided to teachers in grades 3-5. Academic coach, intervention teacher, and administration will group students based on outcome of FAST PM 1. Teachers and intervention teacher will use Magnetic during ELA intervention block for identified students.</p>	<p>Holmgreen, Jennifer, jlholmgr@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 School Improvement Plan will be disseminated the following ways:

- SAC Meetings
- Faculty Meetings
- School Website
- Marquee (announcing to view in front office)
- Link on social media platforms
- PTA Meetings
- Annual Title Meeting

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))

- Webpage for Family Engagement Plan
- Monthly family nights
- Advertisements for all family engagement opportunities on school social media page
- classroom and school newsletter

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)

Collaborative Planning
Weekly PLC
After and before school tutoring
After and before school enrichment
Parent-to-kid workshops
Family nights
Book clubs (Battle of the Books)
Lunch and Listen- Literacy initiative
Area of Focus 1- Instructional Practice: Benchmark aligned 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))

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