

Volusia County Schools

Beachside Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Beachside Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

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

Through the cooperation of all, our students shall acquire the knowledge, wisdom and ethics which will enable them to be productive citizens in an ever-changing global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Beachside Elementary teachers, staff, parents and community members work together to help develop an extraordinary whole child. We strive to offer personalized learning activities that value character development along with meeting the demands of the rigorous Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

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
Prokop, Leigh	Principal	The principal oversees the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school
Cleveland, Melissa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in overseeing the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school.
Via, Julie	Teacher, K-12	The Kindergarten Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark aligned instruction.
Stoner, Amy	Teacher, K-12	The First Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark aligned instruction.
Gilbert, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	The Third Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark aligned instruction.
Comer, Terri	Teacher, K-12	The Second Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark aligned instruction.
Fischer, Kim	Teacher, K-12	The Fourth Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark aligned instruction.
Treur, Deb	Teacher, K-12	The Fifth Grade Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark aligned instruction.
Fuller, Kacie	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The ESE teacher will service ESE students using benchmark aligned instruction.
White, Yahaira	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 benchmarks being taught.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Green, Gay	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 benchmarks being taught.
Schandel, Kimberly Schandel	Administrative Support	The Administrative Teacher on Assignment assists the principal in overseeing the academic goals, school culture and PBIS system at the school.
Quicksall, Kelsi	Teacher, K-12	The Special Area Team Leader will guide team meetings using data to monitor growth proficiency and ensure all teachers understand the standards being taught. The teacher will teach daily using benchmark 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 initial development of the SIP is conducted by members of the school leadership team. This includes classrooms teachers, coaches, support teachers and administration. The team analysis data, identifies barriers, discusses solutions, develops action steps, and determines a plan for implementation and monitoring. The information is then presented at our SAC meeting to gain input from all stakeholders, including parents, students, and business partners.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is monitored monthly by the school leadership team. The SLT works collaboratively to monitor, and problem solve the schools progress in the implementation of the plan. Additionally, administration, coaches and teachers meet monthly in PLC's to discuss grade level specific components and the plan. School administration meets weekly to discuss barriers to plan implementation and work on timely solutions to these concerns.

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 KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: 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	5	40	30	33	23	36	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	1	4	5	6	7	14	0	0	0	37
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	7	16	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	34	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	34	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	22	30	11	19	0	0	0	94

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	6	8	16	12	29	0	0	0	72

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	5	23	28	34	24	21	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	7	3	10	8	7	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	27	30	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	22	28	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	8

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	4	1	9	18	15	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	7	1	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	5	23	28	34	24	21	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	7	3	10	8	7	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	27	30	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	22	28	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	8

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	4	1	9	18	15	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	7	1	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*	46	52	53	42	53	56	54		
ELA Learning Gains				53			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			46		
Math Achievement*	56	55	59	50	42	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				57			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			77		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	54	62	54	46	55	59	57		
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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	204
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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	27	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	2	
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	25	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	47			

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	46			56			54					
SWD	13			27			32				4	
ELL	18			36							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			33			30				4	
HSP	28			44							2	
MUL	53			59							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			63			62				4	
FRL	37			46			44				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	42	53	51	50	57	39	46					
SWD	17	49	50	31	46	28	13					
ELL	20			30								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	47	40	37	58	47	29					
HSP	44	55		18	30							
MUL	33			56								
PAC												
WHT	46	54	63	54	56	42	51					
FRL	40	52	51	47	57	38	42					

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	54	68	46	58	74	77	57					
SWD	11	10		25	50							
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			33								
HSP	50			40								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	69		61	77		61					
FRL	50	64	46	52	70	82	50					

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	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	51%	2%

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.

Our lowest performing area was ELA proficiency. This can be attributed to changes in instructional staff, specifically in 5th grade throughout the year. Despite these barriers Beachside was able to achieve eight points of growth.

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

There were no areas of decline from the 2022-2 school year. However, looking at the 2021-22 school year there were areas of decline in the other accountability components. This includes a drop in science achievement, moving from 57 to 46, ELA gains moving from 68 to 53, math gains moving 74 to 57, and math LQ moving from 77 to 39. It is important to note that Beachside is a new school, and this data is reflective of the old Osceola Elementary.

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 greatest gap between Beachside Elementary and State performance can be found in our 5th grade data. 5th grade scored a 49 compared to the state at 55% in math and 38 compared to the state at 54% in ELA. This can be attributed to the loss of the 5th grade staff throughout the year.

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

Our Math Proficiency showed the most improvement. It increased from 50% to 60%. This can be attributed to the acquisition of a math intervention teacher.

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

Based on our EWS data, fifth grade is a potential area of concern. The student's attendance, suspensions, and academics will need to be monitored closely based on data from the previous year.

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

- ELA instruction aligned to the benchmark
- Math Instruction aligned to the benchmark
- Science instruction aligned to the benchmark
- PBIS
- ESAA subgroups

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.

We have had inconsistencies with the structure, facilitation, and implementation of benchmark aligned instruction. There is work we need to do on defining and strengthening this system as well as how instruction supports our multi-tiered system of support, collaboration and coaching. Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that only 53% of our students reached proficiency in ELA and 50% in Math. With an increased focus on benchmark-aligned instruction, 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.

Beachside Elementary school will use VBA and PM data to track student progress throughout the year. Our end of the year goals is to achieve 62 % ELA achievement, 70% math achievement, 65% science achievement, 60% ELA gains, 65% math gains, 61% ELA LQ gains, and 50% Math LQ gains on the PM 3. Additionally, we would like to have 80% of all teachers using district approved benchmark aligned instructional resources by January 2024. Our ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, HSP, goals are to meet 50% proficiency for each group.

Monitoring:

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

We will use benchmark assessments, VBA data and PM 1 and 2 data to track students achievement. Additionally, we will use support facilitation logs, MTSS, PLC, and collaborative planning minutes to track our progress towards appropriately targeting students supports and aligning appropriate resources. We will use instructional planning meeting minutes to help track our ESSA data as well as using PM and VBA data to track the ESSA groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Prokop (lprokop@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.)

Teachers will be trained in Kagan Cooperative Learning with a focus on differentiation through instructional blocks. Differentiated instruction through intervention WIN blocks will take place daily to support the individual learning needs of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Dr. Hattie's research supports the use of small group instruction with a .72 effect size. We accessing this needs through specifically designated instruction times in the ELA and Math blocks. This includes the implementation of our walk to intervention model (WIN) with a number of service providers including classroom teachers, support facilitation instructors, interventionist, and coaches.

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.

School Leadership team will walk classrooms to monitor delivery of benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible: Leigh Prokop (lprokop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will begin in August. .

Tiered coaching support for planning of and delivery of benchmark-aligned instruction will be provided based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will begin in August

Coaches will model implementation of instructional frameworks, instructional practices, and utilization of student tasks aligned to benchmarks based on walkthrough and assessment data.

Person Responsible: Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will begin in August

Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends, and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible: Melissa Cleveland (mgclevel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will begin in August

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Beachside Elementary recruited approximal 20 new teachers and support staff to our school. Properly onboarding, training and retaining them will be paramount to building our culture and increasing student performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All teachers' new teachers will successfully complete the TIPS program by June 2024
 75% of teacher will report a positive school environment on the SAC climate survey.
 95% of new teachers will attend monthly mentoring support sessions.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor teacher completion of the TIPS program on a monthly basis. Additionally, we will take attendance and record meeting minutes of the mentoring meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Cleveland (mgclevel@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.)

Dr. Hattie's research supports the incorporation of teacher voice in supporting teachers and increasing recruitment and retention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing teachers with an opportunity to have leadership opportunities and express their views and opinion on topics provide an opportunity for inclusion and ownership.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Monitor TIP progress

Person Responsible: Melissa Cleveland (mgclevel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Monthly mentoring meetings

Person Responsible: Meredith Gilbert (mlgilber@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August -May

Weekly coaching and support

Person Responsible: Gay Green (gagreene@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August-May

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).

In order to use funds for school improvement a request must be made to the SAC committee. The request is presented and voted on by the committee. Only request that align with the schools improvement plan will be approved. The proposal should include rationale and supporting data to indicate how it will positively impact our students, specifically the areas outlined for support in the SIP.

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 currently are at 43% of our students learning at our above grade level in grades K-2. We will be implementing a walk to intervention model WIN (what I need) to target students' areas of need. Teachers will utilize the decision tree, placing students in reading tiers and then utilize district approved resources to increase student learning. We will be utilizing "How to be a Reader," during our small group instruction. Benchmark intervention materials and SIPS will be used to fill phonics gaps. We will use district assessments and FAST PM1 and 2 to progress monitor students. Additionally, unit assessments and formative assessments will be used to help guide instruction on a weekly basis.

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

We currently are at 50% of our students learning at our above grade level in grades 3-5 according to FAST PM3. We will be implementing a walk to intervention model WIN (what I need) to target students' areas of need. Teachers will utilize the decision tree, placing students in reading tiers and then utilize district approved resources to increase student learning. We have purchased Magnetic reading, which

will be utilized during small group time in combination with Benchmark advance materials to meet the state benchmarks in ELA instruction. We will use district assessments and FAST PM1 and 2 to progress monitor students. Additionally, unit assessments and formative assessments will be used to help guide instruction on a weekly basis.

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

District VBA's and FAST Pm1 and 2 assessments will be used to guide instruction as we work to have 60% of students in grade K-2 at a 3 or above on FAST PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

District VBA's and FAST Pm1 and 2 assessments will be used to guide instruction as we work to have 60% of students in grade 3-5 at a 3 or above on FAST PM3.

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.

Student progress will be monitored through PLC meetings, weekly MTSS meetings, and instructional leadership meetings. A spreadsheet will be maintained on students in the MTSS process and strategies being used and results obtained. Spreadsheets will also be maintained for grade level WIN groups including service provider, resources used and student verification of learning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

White, Yahaira, ylwhite@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?

We will be utilizing small group instruction both in our 90-minute ELA block and in our intervention/enrichment block WIN. Small group instruction has a .74 effect size according to Dr. Hattie’s research.

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?

Providing students with focused small group instruction based on the benchmark and data on areas of growth and concern allows us to effectively reach students on an individual level while meeting state benchmark requirements.

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
Academic and Reading coach will work with teachers in K-5 to target instruction based on student's needs.	White, Yahaira, ylwhite@volusia.k12.fl.us
Students in tier 2 and 3 will be monitored through the MTSS process. This includes weekly meeting minutes and an excel spreadsheet with areas of focus, interventions, and next steps.	Schandel, Kimberly Schandel, kcschand@volusia.k12.fl.us
PLC's focused on data from PM1 and 2, unit assessments and district assessments. This will be monitored through PLC notes.	Green, Gay, gagreene@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 SIP will be shared with our teachers at the School Leadership Team meeting. The SIP will be presented to the SAC committee. A copy of the plan will be kept at the front desk for stakeholders to view upon request. The SIP will be monitored throughout the year through Leadership Team Meetings.

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))

We will host at least two academic family nights to educate families and provide support. These will be advertised on social media, flyers, and on the school signage.

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)

Beachside Elementary will adhere to the master schedule and ensure we are teaching bell to bell. Student data will be analyzed and groups will be developed for enrichment through our walk to model. We will utilize our part-time gifted teacher to assist with student enrichment.

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))

Not applicable