Sugar Mill Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sugarmill/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.

With the cooperation of home, school, and community, the Sugar Mill family will provide a warm, caring atmosphere where all children will be challenged to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Panthers Always Will Succeed

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
Boggs, Dawn-Marie	Administrative Support	Mrs. Boggs is a TOA, teacher on assignment and is responsible to support our EBD population.
Sullo, Carol	Principal	Principal is responsible to meet the needs of all stakeholders at Sugar Mill Elementary. She oversees all programs and is instrumental in making sure all of our students get the education they deserve.
Van Slyke, Shannon	Assistant Principal	School Improvement Plan coordinator, ESE administrator, and supporting the principal in all areas.
Snodgrass, Traci	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach, responsible to make sure all teachers understand curriculum and presenting professional development.
Brigandi, Jill	Instructional Coach	She is the 3rd-5th ELA Intervention teacher. She works with our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to remediate academic deficits in ELA
Turner, Heather	Instructional Coach	She is the 3rd-5th ELA Intervention teacher. She works with our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to remediate academic deficits in ELA

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 SLT began working on a draft format of the School Improvement Plan in July. The draft form was presented to the faculty and staff for input in August. The SIP will be presented at the first SAC meeting and the first PTA meeting to solicit input from all stakeholders. The plan will be available in the front office and presented on the school website. After all approvals, it will be posted on FB, X, and the school website. We will review all school data in October and do the Stocktake process for Sugar Mill Elementary. After analyzing the data from all summative and formative assessments, the SLT will discuss any concerns that we have for our students. At this time, we will refine our plan and make changes where necessary to promote student success. In February, we will do another Stocktake, to see if any changes need to be made to make sure all students are successful.

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))

We will review all school data in October and do the Stocktake process for Sugar Mill Elementary. After analyzing the data from all summative and formative assessments, the SLT will discuss any concerns that we have for our students. At this time, we will refine our plan and make changes where necessary to promote student success. In February, we will do another Stocktake, to see if any changes need to be made to make sure all students are successful. The School Improvement Plan will remain a living document that will be evaluated throughout the year to make sure that our students are meeting academic success.

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	30%
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)* 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: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B
	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	17	27	28	38	19	21	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	17	6	15	0	0	0	49
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	0	10	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	12	18	6	18	0	0	0	57

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	2	3	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	16	18	27	21	21	26	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	14	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	14	13	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	22

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	1	4	2	9	0	0	0	17

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	16	18	27	21	21	26	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	14	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	14	13	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	22

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	1	4	2	9	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	51	52	53	60	53	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				61			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			41		
Math Achievement*	56	55	59	59	42	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				56			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			18		
Science Achievement*	56	62	54	59	55	59	61		
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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	207
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL	30	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	58			

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	45			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	42			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	50			

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	51			56			56					
SWD	24			24			27				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			37							2	
HSP	38			44							2	
MUL	36			23							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	56			65			62				4	
FRL	45			51			43				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	60	61	46	59	56	35	59					
SWD	22	44	36	23	34	24	28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	47	45	35	61	45	31					
HSP	45	56		36	29		45					
MUL	53			60								
PAC												
WHT	68	65	45	67	59	36	67					
FRL	54	59	46	52	53	34	52					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	61	57	41	61	46	18	61					
SWD	20	36	46	25	21	23	29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	55		13	17		20					
HSP	69			65								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63	61		66	51		63					
FRL	54	51	44	54	47	19	59					

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	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	51%	5%

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 was 3rd Grade ELA which was 45% in comparison to the District which was 53%. Intervention for Third grade did not start till April in ELA and was not consistent due to lack of staffing. The MTSS process was not completed with fidelity. The teachers were not using district approved intervention.

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 greatest decline from the prior year was ELA which was 60% in the 2020-2022 school year and 52% in the 2022-2023. Third grade had 5 teachers and 2 were team teaching. The team teaching pair out performed the other 3 classes. Math intervention teaching was not filled until April 17th.

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.

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average which was 50% in ELA. Volusia was 53% and our school data was 60% in the 2021-2022 school year and 52% in the 2022-2023. One of the factors that we must consider is 4th grade departmentalized for the first time. Fifth grade was departmentalized and some of the grade level did not want to departmentalized. PLCs were not consistent so the follow through of analyzing was not consistent as well.

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

The data component showed the most improvement was 3rd Grade Math which was 62%. In the 2021-2022 it was 55% which had us going up 7 points. Strong classroom instruction in Math was occurring throughout the year. Teachers made sure students were not missing instruction. Intensive Tiered Intervention was implemented with fidelity.

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

One of our potential areas of concerns is discipline. In the 2021-22, Sugar Mill Elementary had 563 referrals for the year, in the 2022-2023 SME had 716 referrals. With 50% of our referrals were SWD students we know that it must be an area of focus. The other potential area of of concern is attendance at 89% which is down from the year before 0f 91%.

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

1. ELA
2. Science
3. Discipline
4. Attendance

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.

The Area of Focus for our Instructional Practice is specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction. Classroom Data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to intended learning of the benchmark. Additionally, our Need Assessment and Analysis revealed that only 52% of our student's reached proficiency in ELA, 56% in Science and 62% in Math. Only 30% of the SWD met the proficiency level on PM3 and has falling below the 41% for the past 3 years. Goal 58% in ELA, 64% Math, and 62% in Science. Focus on SWD to meet 42% proficiency. With an increased focus aligned instruction and task, student proficiency will increase state assessments.

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

During the 2023-2024, 75% of our students will score a 70% or higher on Benchmark-aligned Assessments. By May 2024, 58% of the students in our 3rd-5th grade groups will be able to score a 3 or higher on our District PM2. By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, as evidenced through walkthroughs. By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%. Goal 58% in ELA, 64% Math, and 61% in Science. Focus on SWD to meet 42% proficiency.

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

Walk through data will be evaluated monthly by administration. District data will be analyzed after assessments are given during PLCs and comparing it to the district and state trends. Tier support will be monitored through evaluating data formulated by coaching support logs.

Student Practice:
*Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state proficiency.
*75% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year.

Teacher Practice:
*Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
*Administration and Academic Coach will attend common planning to monitor for benchmark aligned planning of tasks.

Coaching Practice:
*Administration and Academic Coach 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 Academic Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Carol Sullo (cmsullo@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.)

The evidence-based interventions to be implemented: We will use collaborative planning on a weekly basis to plan and implement benchmark aligned instruction. It will be monitored through weekly walk throughs per individual data and school wide trends.

School Based:
Attendance/Discipline Tracking & Training-ELA Intervention Teachers
Grade Level Collaborative Planning- Admin and Coach
Verification of Learning- Walkthroughs
Classroom Walks with feedback-Admin
Coaching- PLC, Coaching Logs, Walkthroughs
Peer Learning Walks-Faculty
Before, During, & After school tutoring-Faculty

District Based:
Updated Curriculum Maps
PowerPoints and benchmark-aligned questions that are on grade level
Redesign of small group instruction
Robust curriculum and instruction resources
MTSS
Early Warning System monthly meetings

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.
Through PLC's, walkthroughs, Coaching logs, and weekly collaboration we will see an increase in students scoring proficiency on district and state assessments as monitored throughout the year.
We will use curriculum maps, the Big M, question stems, and evidence from walk throughs to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from collaborative planning.

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.

- Create a master schedule that allows grade level specific collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coach.
-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, and student use of academic language.
-Instructional coach and administration will collaboratively review completed planning protocols, Administration notes from planning observation, and curriculum maps.
-Feedback will be provided at least one week ahead of when lessons will be presented to teachers.
-Provide Coaching support based on walkthrough data using look fors through a tiered coaching support plan.

Person Responsible: Carol Sullo (cmsullo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Collaborative planning will be conducted 1 time a week and each grade level will be given time once a quarter to extensively pace and plan instruction as well as develop formative assessments. Walkthroughs will conducted on a weekly basis by administration and coach.

Faculty and staff will be asked to do collaborative planning during PLCs and/or after school collaborative planning time. Administration and Coach will be conducting walkthroughs looking for the "look fors" for teacher instructional practice.

School Based:
Attendance/Discipline Tracking & Training
ELA Intervention Teachers
Grade Level Collaborative Planning
Verification of Learning
Classroom Walks with feedback
Coaching
Peer Learning Walks
Before, During, & After school tutoring

District Based:
Updated Curriculum Maps
PowerPoints and benchmark-aligned questions that are on grade level
Redesign of small group instruction
Robust curriculum and instruction resources
MTSS
Early Warning System monthly meetings

Person Responsible: Carol Sullo (cmsullo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: We will be conducting walkthroughs throughout the year and during weekly leadership meetings discussing trends. We will use trend data to discuss during our "Stocktake" in October and February to drive any changes in our plan.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

In order to create a positive culture and environment at Sugar Mill this 2023-2024 school year, we will reducing our discipline referral rate from 719 to 300 or below. We will provide training on when it is appropriate to write a referral and how we are addressing the behaviors that are occurring. Fifty percent of our referrals are from our SWD population. With the implementation of our MTSS supports with fidelity and truly targeting the IEP/BIP goals that are already established, we will see the decrease of referrals. Only 30% of our SWD students met proficiency on PM3 in ELA which falls below the ESSA score of 41%. When reviewing our EWS, we noted a significant attendance with over 150 students missing 10% of the school year. Forty nine students have had 1 or more suspensions. With an increase in training for faculty, MTSS supports, and all stakeholders understanding the students goals and behavior plans, we will decrease Sugar Mill's Elementary number of referrals, suspensions, and lack of attendance of our students.

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

If we increase training, MTSS supports, understanding our students IEP goals and BIP, our referrals will decrease from 719 to below 300 for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

-Through at least 2 ESE PLC meetings a month in which administration, TOA, and all the ESE teachers collaborate to monitor data of referrals, suspensions, IEP goals, and BIPs to make sure we are implementing all plans with fidelity.
-Administration will conduct monthly MTSS School Leadership Team meetings focusing on EWS report and developing an action plan on those students in the EWS reports with 3-5 indicators.
-Provide teachers the training during faculty meetings, PLCs, collaborative planning, and ERPLS to support the students' needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carol Sullo (cmsullo@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.)

Professional Development: Based on evidence, provide professional development and collaborative planning to deepen the teachers understanding of discipline procedures, understanding the IEPs and BIPs, the MTSS process and implementation to increase capacity among staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

After analyzing our discipline data, we learned that we had 719 referrals in the 2022-2023 school year and 50% of them were SWD. As we reexamine our discipline procedures and provide training for our staff, our discipline referrals should increase overall and with our SWD.

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.

-Present discipline data at a faculty meeting and discuss the data trends we see. (Assistant Principal)
-Assistant Principal presents training on "Life of a Referral".
-ERPL developed on examining IEP goals and BIPs for entire faculty and how to track meaningful data.(AP)
-ERPL given on MTSS supports and process. (MTSS facilitator)
-TOA conduct bimonthly PLC meeting to discuss referrals, suspensions, IEP goals, tracking and BIPS.
-AP pulls the EWS report and students are discussed at all PLCs
-Administration will conduct monthly MTSS School Leadership Team meetings focusing on EWS report and developing an action plan on those students in the EWS reports with 3-5 indicators.
-Academic Coach to provide support with classroom management if needed

Person Responsible: Carol Sullo (cmsullo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: During faculty meetings, bimonthly ESE PLC, gen-ed PLC, ERPLS, and professional development throughout the school year.

-Present discipline data at a faculty meeting and discuss the data trends we see. (Assistant Principal)
-Assistant Principal presents training on "Life of a Referral".
-ERPL developed on examining IEP goals and BIPs for entire faculty and how to track meaningful data.(AP)
-ERPL given on MTSS supports and process. (MTSS facilitator)
-TOA conduct bimonthly PLC meeting to discuss referrals, suspensions, IEP goals, tracking and BIPS.
-AP pulls the EWS report and students are discussed at all PLCs
-Academic Coach to provide support with classroom management if needed

Person Responsible: Carol Sullo (cmsullo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: During faculty meetings, bimonthly ESE PLC, gen-ed PLC, ERPLS, and professional development throughout the school year.

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
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.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
[no one identified]
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.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
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.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School Improvement funding allocations are awarded from the School Advisory Council. Resources are allocated based on inclusion with School Improvement Plan. For the 23-24 school year, a focus on School Improvement funds will be focused on ELA, SWD, and a positive culture improvement. Systems have been put in place to better monitor SWD. The ESE team, as a whole will be meeting once a month in a PLC. ESE AP will monitor every two weeks, lesson gain charts, support facilitation logs, and ESE data collection. Feedback will be given to teachers. ESE Progress reports will be monitored to ensure data is being used when writing the reports. Each grade level will give to administration their plan for documenting accommodations for students with disabilities, and this will be monitored on a regular basis.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In 2022-2023 school year, 58% of our first grade students scored below the 40th percentile as indicated on the Spring 2023 STAR Reading assessment.

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

In 2022-2023 school year, 54% of our third grade students scored below a level 3 on the FAST ELA assessment.

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

By January 2024,the overall ELA achievement on STAR Reading for our current second graders will show a proficiency of 49%. In May 2024, Sugar Mill Elementary will increase overall ELA achievement on STAR Reading to show a proficiency of 58% in which there would be 31% scoring below the 40th percentile. By May 2024 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidence by classroom visits. Tiered coaching support based classroom look-fors and data will occur throughout the year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By January 2024, the overall ELA achievement on the FAST ELA assessment for our current fourth graders will show a proficiency of 49%. In May 2024, Sugar Mill Elementary will increase overall ELA achievement on the FAST ELA assessment to show a proficiency of 58% in which there would be 39% scoring below a level three. By May 2024 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidence by classroom visits. Tiered coaching support based classroom walkthrough look-fors and data will occur throughout the year.

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 Areas of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations using the ELA Look-For Tool focusing on explicit instruction aligned to the benchmark and intended learning; tasks aligned to the benchmark and intended learning; questioning to deepen the understanding of the intended learning; and students are provided with opportunities to collaborate needed to impact student growth.
Tiered coaching support based on classroom walkthrough look-fors that occur weekly.
At least once a month PLCs will engage in data analysis of students to determine the effect of the intervention.
Collaborative planning for quality instruction focusing on lower performing benchmarks as seen in data will occur weekly.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sullo, Carol, cmsullo@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?

Sugar Mill Elementary will use Small Group Intervention as the strategy for this area of focus. We will monitor it through weekly classroom walkthrough by school based administration, academic coach, and district support team. The feedback from the look-fors from the classroom walkthroughs will shared with the teachers to guide them in planning and instructing for the students' learning and determining instructional next steps. Our Tier 3 students will work with our intervention teachers based on student data.
Sugar Mill Elementary will also utilized tiered based coaching support to partner with teachers to help them improve teaching and learning in order for the students to be successful.

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?

Small group intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie for visible learning outcomes for students. The key is making teaching and learning visible which includes intervention which has a high effect on students.
Coaching when conducted over time in conjunction with data team analysis of how students learn to inform instruction, student growth is impacted with an effect size of .51 according to John Hattie's meta-analysis.
Programs being utilized for small group intervention include SIPPS, Benchmark Advance Interventions Comprehension Lessons, I Ready Teacher Toolbox, and Magnetics.

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
Provide on-going professional learning in ELA whole and small group using the Benchmark Resources and I Ready Magnetics and well as a SIPPS refresher. Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for the alignment between the benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers understanding the desired outcomes for their students. Teachers will also plan specific higher order questions to ask during small group instruction and develop formative assessments.	Sullo, Carol, cmsullo@volusia.k12.fl.us
Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning intentions, share best practices in instruction of the benchmark, progress monitor benchmarks in ELA based on assessments , determine students who need additional intervention to be successful as well as for enrichment as based on the data from STAR Literacy (K-1), STAR Reading (2), FAST ELA (3-5), and district assessments. Develop WIN (What I Need) groups at PLC and monitor implementation of small group intervention and enrichment groups monthly. Intervention teachers will provide support for our Tier 3 students.	Van Slyke, Shannon, ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us
Based on the classroom walkthroughs by administration and the student data, teachers will be provided a coach to support them with accomplishing an established goal in order to increase student success.	Sullo, Carol, cmsullo@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.

The Title 1 plan and SIP plan will be disseminated by sharing and soliciting input at a faculty meeting, SAC meeting, and PTA meeting. We will provide a link on the school webpage, FB, and X. In all areas of social media, Sugar Mill will provide an input form for all of our stockholders to contribute input or concerns. The School Improvement Plan will be presented at our first Title 1 Meeting that will be held before Open House in September and in the front office for anyone to view. We will conduct another Title 1 meeting in December and a final one in February. It will be advertised for all events and dissemination on the school marquee, social media, messenger, and a flyer going home to all parents.

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))

Sugar Mill is planning a literacy, Science and Math night to help encourage our parents to be a part of their student's education. Sugar Mill host family activities such as "Trunk or Treat", "Parent to Kid workshop, various PTA and Spirit Nights. As a school community, it is our goal to increase our parent involvement and engage our families in productive educational opportunities.

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 Improvement Plan gives Sugar Mill a plan of focus on improving academic progress in all subject areas by increasing collaborative planning and analyzing data during our PLC and collaborative planning time. During the focused planning time, teachers will examine standards and instruction to ensure that the depth of knowledge is reached and the instruction is aligned.
At Sugar Mill, we protect instructional time. With a Master schedule that is created for the entire school to ensure that all subjects areas are taught each day for the adequate amount of time to successfully master the standards expected.
Tutoring will be provided before, during and after school to remediate skills necessary for students to master on level instruction. Standard based tutoring will be used to fill in the gaps for students that have struggled to work at grade level mastery. Enrichment will be provided to increase academic capacity to challenge and support academic achievement in all students.

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))

ESSA has provided a grant that will support before, during and after school. Through this grant we can provide opportunities for all children to receive remediation/enrichment to increase their academic capacity.

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))

Optional

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))

Optional

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).

Optional

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))

Optional

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))

Optional

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$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