

Volusia County Schools

Edgewater Public 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Edgewater Public School

801 S OLD COUNTY RD, Edgewater, FL 32132

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

"All stakeholders at Edgewater Public will affect positive change in our school, community, and beyond as we develop our skills in communication, creativity, critical thinking and collaboration."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Through the shared responsibility of all, we will provide a safe learning environment that fosters commitment, collaboration, and creativity in a changing world."

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
Lavallee, Sharon	Principal	The principal oversees the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school
Bryer, Kyle	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in overseeing the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school.
Amato, Melanie	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will collaborate with teachers to support academic achievement for all students. The instructional coach will guide PLC Meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught.
Johnson, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Teacher will use data to monitor growth proficiency and will collaborate with other grade level teachers to understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.
Mowrey, Keri	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Teacher will use data to monitor growth proficiency and will collaborate with other grade level teachers to understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.
Lippert, Alicia	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher will use data to monitor growth proficiency and will collaborate with other grade level teachers to understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using standards aligned instruction.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team completed individual sections and goal areas in response to data. Teachers and SAC members will provide input following the return to school. SIP goals and action steps will be formed and adjusted based on input from each stakeholder group.

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))

State assessments will be analyzed to ensure that progress is made in relationship to SIP goals. SIP team and the school leadership team will meet regularly to review and revise action steps to ensure progress is made toward identified goals.

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	18%
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: B 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	14	24	19	18	11	13	0	0	0	99	
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	15	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	16	17	20	10	6	0	0	0	74	

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	6	7	10	6	5	0	0	0	34

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	2	6	8	11	18	2	0	0	0	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	18	0	0	0	28	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	5	2	8	6	3	0	0	0	31	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	6	8	11	18	2	0	0	0	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	18	0	0	0	28	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	5	2	8	6	3	0	0	0	31	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
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*	56	52	53	57	53	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				59			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			63		
Math Achievement*	65	55	59	66	42	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				62			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			63		
Science Achievement*	76	62	54	71	55	59	62		
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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	30	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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	56			

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	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL	39	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	54			

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	56			65			76					
SWD	23			34			57				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			30							2	
HSP												
MUL	62			50							2	

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	57			69			82				4	
FRL	50			62			67				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	57	59	46	66	62	46	71					
SWD	21	39	27	32	44	38	33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	45			33								
PAC												
WHT	59	58	43	70	63	48	74					
FRL	50	56	46	60	56	42	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	53	61	63	63	68	63	62					
SWD	31	73	73	27	53		29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	18			45								
PAC												
WHT	57	69	69	65	67	58	68					
FRL	49	53	54	59	63	60	58					

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	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	50%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	57%	4%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	59%	19%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	51%	24%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to PM3 data, our 3rd grade ELA data had the lowest performance at 47% proficient. The factors that contribute to this low performance include loss of experienced teacher, intervention teachers put in classroom, one of two ELA teachers was new to education. This cohort of students in previous year experienced change in staff for two consecutive years.

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

According to PM3 data, our 3rd grade ELA data had the greatest decline from the previous year. Performance decreased 17% from 64% to 47%. The factors that contribute to this decline from the prior year include loss of experienced teacher, intervention teachers put in classroom, one of two ELA teachers was new to education. This cohort of students in previous year experienced change in staff for two consecutive years.

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 SSA data, our 3rd grade ELA data had the greatest gap compared to the state. The state average was 50%. We were at 47% for a difference of 3%. The factors that contribute to gap include loss of experienced teacher, intervention teachers put in classroom, one of two ELA teachers was new to education. This cohort of students in previous year experienced change in staff for two consecutive years.

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 had the greatest increase in improvement, from 60% to 78%.

New actions that contributed to the improvement include having a new teacher willing to except mentorship and implement suggested strategies. A very cohesive team that was willing to collaborate. Intervention teacher support in math. ESE support was able to meet with students consistently due to the Math block being in the afternoon.

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

After studying the EWS the area with the most concern is student attendance. 24% of Edgewater Public School students are missing 10% or more of the school year.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are: Planning, MTSS, Coaching.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

School attendance data indicates a need for a reduction in student absences and tardies. 24% of students were absent more than 10% of the school year. With an increased attendance rate, student academic proficiency will increase

Measurable Outcome:

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

By January 2024, the 24% of students will be reduced to 18% according the Early Warning System and FOCUS reports. By May 2024, the 18% of students will be reduced to 14%. This would be a 42% decrease for the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will communicate clear timelines and expectations with teachers in regards to student attendance; and collect weekly feedback and data from attendance reports and classroom visits. EWS will be monitored and analyzed during PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@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.)

Admin Lead Team will implement a systematic attendance plan for school staff follow. It will be monitored through fidelity checks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System (EWIMS) is a promising strategy for getting students back on track for graduation. This includes a purposeful, planning focused on identification of students at risk of not graduating on time, assigning students to interventions, and monitoring their progress.

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.

Implement Teacher Communication Logs

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of First Quarter

Training for Guidance Counselor on Attendance PST/MTSS

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of First Quarter

School Social worker will make connections with parents through parent conferences and home visits. Social Worker will provide truancy list to Admin lead team.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of First Quarter

Focus PLCs on weekly attendance concerns. Incorporate data analysis into PLCs.

Person Responsible: Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of First Quarter

Admin Lead Team will contact parents and make home visits as necessary.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of First Semester

Admin Lead Team will host data chats with classroom teachers

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Two chats by the end of the school year

Student Incentive Plan

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of first semester

#2. 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.

Classroom walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark, as only 50% of teachers delivered ELA benchmark-aligned instruction.

Additionally, our FSA data revealed that only 57% of our students reached proficiency. With an increased focus aligned instruction with in ELA, 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.

By February 2024, 55% of 3rd-5th grade students will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 2. By April 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned ELA instruction and tasks, as evidenced through walkthroughs. By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will use district developed criteria (Look-fors) aligned to the benchmark and intended learning to use during classroom walkthroughs. Administration will collect data and communicate the data to teachers. Administration will provide individual feedback to teachers based on specific teacher needs. Administration will set the expectations for and attend subject area PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@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.)

K-2 will implement SIPP which is a systematic foundational skills program. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during intervention time and through monitoring of Mastery test data.

3-5 will implement an ELA intervention block that will focus on the individual needs of students differentiated by progress monitoring data and classroom assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The above evidence-based strategies help ensure that all students receive the same opportunities for intentional practice and skill development at their individual level of performance.

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.

Instructional coaches with administration will facilitate weekly benchmark-aligned planning; to include aligned tasks, application of intended learning, questioning to deepen understanding, teacher use of academic language, student application of intended learning to complete task, student use of academic language.

Person Responsible: Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year

Provide coaching support based on walkthrough data using look fors through tiered coaching support plan developed with trends

Person Responsible: Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the year

Coaches will model implementation of instructional frameworks, instructional practices, and utilization of student tasks aligned to benchmarks during planning and indicate support plan (focus, frequency and method of support) and next steps in coaching log.

Person Responsible: Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the year

Admin lead team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the year

Academic lead team will meet weekly to review trends, and adjust as needed

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

The results from VST and Science Topic Checks show inconsistent data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to maintain the percentage of students achieving a 3 or higher on the Science FSA at 72%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will use district developed criteria (Look-fors) aligned to the benchmark and intended learning to use during classroom walkthroughs. Administration will collect data and communicate the data to teachers. Administration will provide individual feedback to teachers based on specific teacher needs. Administration will set the expectations for and attend subject area PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Lavalley (salavall@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.)

Grades K-5 will implement a science block that will focus on benchmark aligned instruction with intentional practice and skill development at individual students level of performance. This will be monitored by progress monitoring data and classroom assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

General STEM instruction covers multiple topics and introduces a range of foundational, broadly applicable STEM practices. STEM knowledge and skills are critical to students' academic achievement and setting them on a path to high school completion and readiness for college and careers.

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.

Review of previous science district and state assessments.

Person Responsible: Melanie Amato (maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the first quarter

Administer VBA to 5th grade students and VSTs to 3rd - 5th grade students.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the semester

Facilitate PL on Science Standards and STEM Process.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the school year

Conduct progress monitoring meetings every 5-6 weeks to review data to plan instruction.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every 5-6 weeks

Monitor science instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs and feedback.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the school year

Meetings with DLT for technology planning support.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the school year

Academic coach meets with principal and PLC weekly, and Individual Teachers as aligned with District coaching model.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the school year

Professional Learning on PENDA 2.0 for grades 3-5 teachers.

Person Responsible: Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of the school year

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 approved by the Principal and the SAC committee to ensure that the allocations are aligned with our 3rd grade ELA, Science and school attendance goals.

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

We are currently waiting on the K-2 data.

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

Based on ELA FAST PM3, 47% of students in grade 3 scored Level 3 or above. Based on FAST PM3, 67% of students in grade 4 scored Level 3 or above. Based on FAST PM3, 64% of students in grade 5 scored Level 3 or above.

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

We are currently waiting on data to know if we need a measurable outcome.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By February 2024, 55% of 3rd - 5th grade students will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 2. By April 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned ELA instruction and tasks, as evidenced through walkthroughs. By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%

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.

Areas of focus will be monitored through data analysis at PLC's, administration walk-throughs, PM1 data, STEM & academic planning days.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@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 being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome in 3rd grade includes ELA benchmark advanced curriculum, ELA benchmark intervention toolkit, collaborative planning days, & magnetic intervention (all aligned to the BEST standards)

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?

All resources are district approved ELA resources and curriculum. These are all aligned to the BEST standards and will address the identified needs.

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
Instructional coaches with administration will facilitate weekly benchmark-aligned planning; to include aligned tasks, application of intended learning, questioning to deepen understanding, teacher use of academic language, student application of intended learning to complete task, student use of academic language.	Amato, Melanie, maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us
Provide coaching support based on walkthrough data using look fors through tiered coaching support plan developed with trends	Amato, Melanie, maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us
Coaches will model implementation of instructional frameworks, instructional practices, and utilization of student tasks aligned to benchmarks during planning and indicate support plan (focus, frequency and method of support) and next steps in coaching log.	Amato, Melanie, maamato@volusia.k12.fl.us
Admin lead team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from collaborative planning.	Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us
Academic lead team will meet weekly to review trends, and adjust as needed	Lavallee, Sharon, salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us

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

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

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

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

Edgewater Public will disseminate the school-wide plan through Title I Annual Meeting, Parent and Family Engagement meetings and workshops, other informational sessions, and available on our 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))

Edgewater Public School will continue to build positive relationships by increasing our efforts to communicate with our families. We will do this by continued use of our monthly school newsletters and weekly School Messenger calls. We will also provide Title I parent nights to build parent content area knowledge. These nights will provide the expectations for FSA, and more in depth knowledge of what students are learning in class. Title I meetings include: 1. Title I Annual Meeting 2. Meet the teacher 3. Open House 4. STEM Family night 5. Science Fair 6. Mystery Family Night 7. Book Fair Night 8. Fort Night 9. STEM Night 10. Book Fair Night 11. Science Project Information Night. 12.. Title I money is used to provide a Parent Liaison to help build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. 13.. SEL lessons in the classroom with teacher daily

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))

Teachers will have regular opportunities for collaboration and professional learning communities to share effective teaching practices and discuss strategies for curriculum enrichment. We will actively involve families in the academic program by providing workshops on supporting learning at home, understanding curriculum, and effective communication with teachers. We will use a variety of formative and summative assessments to track student progress. Teachers will regularly analyze assessment data to identify areas of improvement and adjust instructional strategies.

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))

Edgewater Public will collaborate with parent engagement programs, we will empower parents to actively participate in their child's education through workshops, resources, and involvement opportunities.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$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