

Volusia County Schools

South Daytona Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

South Daytona Elementary School

600 ELIZABETH PL, South Daytona, FL 32119

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/southdaytona/pages/default.aspx>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

All students see themselves as learners, and goal crushers who, with hard work and perseverance, have limitless possibilities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will leave South Daytona with pathways to their high school diploma and all post-secondary options; work, military, 2-year college, 4-year college or trade.

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
Devaney, Carrie Ann	Principal	
Jilka, Jane	Assistant Principal	
Conyers, Heather	Instructional Coach	
Curylo, James	Instructional Coach	
Ephraim, Mikeeta	Instructional Coach	
Ramos, Janice	Teacher, K-12	

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.

During the spring, the SIP was discussed and asked for input by PTA. Additionally, the data was shared with teachers during pre-planning at which the plan was shared for the upcoming year. Finally, the principal held a meeting with community leaders in which she shared the plans for the upcoming school year and ways the community could support South Daytona Elementary.

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))

SIP Monitoring includes: differentiated core instruction each day, on pace, (ON GRADE LEVEL), use intervention time to remediate and reassess, track instructional windows, count down to assessment, use exit tickets to gauge progress of the class and get students involved, communication/data chats with

students and parents, intervention provided by intervention teachers daily, all Student Differentiated Instructional groups daily, and classroom visits, and look-fors across content and grade levels.

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	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: 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	8	40	48	50	26	30	0	0	0	202	
One or more suspensions	0	15	13	11	8	20	0	0	0	67	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	10	2	2	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	7	12	2	24	0	0	0	51

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	1	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	108	21	17	18	11	15	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	12	6	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	8	6	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	23	41	0	0	0	74	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	33	35	0	0	0	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	

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	0	7	18	16	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	108	21	17	18	11	15	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	12	6	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	8	6	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	23	41	0	0	0	74	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	33	35	0	0	0	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	

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	0	7	18	16	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	41	52	53	40	53	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				48			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			47		
Math Achievement*	42	55	59	43	42	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				51			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			29		
Science Achievement*	46	62	54	40	55	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59				64		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	170
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	13	Yes	4	4
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	4	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	46			

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%
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	45			

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	41			42			46					
SWD	11			14			6				4	
ELL	36			36							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			22			36				4	
HSP	45			29			30				4	
MUL	38			42			54				4	
PAC												
WHT	52			55			52				4	
FRL	41			40			49				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	40	48	42	43	51	54	40					
SWD	19	36	39	19	30	40	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	26	39	45	24	42	50	21					
HSP	46	47		39	53							
MUL	30	61		37	63	55	27					
PAC												
WHT	51	52	31	56	54	50	60					
FRL	41	50	39	40	52	55	40					

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	46	50	47	43	39	29	49					64
SWD	15	37	45	12	39	33	27					
ELL												64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	33		26	23		27					
HSP	38			24								
MUL	44			42								
PAC												
WHT	57	61		57	55		63					
FRL	46	47	46	41	39	29	47					

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	47%	57%	-10%	58%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	55%	-25%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	51%	-8%

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 2022 2023 third graders who are now our fourth graders performed 7% lower in ELA than the 4th graders who are going to 5th and 4% lower in math. The percent change from PM 1 to PM 3 was +25% in 3rd grade ELA compared to the district change of +32%. Fourth-grade ELA change in proficiency from PM 1 to PM 3 was 22% compared to the district percent change of 28%. Third-grade ELA was 13% below the district, and fourth-grade ELA was 10% below the district according to PM 3. In math third grade was 12% below the district average and fourth grade was 10% below the district according to PM3 data.

South Daytona Elementary opened with 4 teacher vacancies out of 6 units in our 5th-grade classrooms. In fourth grade had 1 teacher vacancy out of 6 units and third grade was fully staffed. Our two coaches were pulled until October and November to fill in for the vacancies. From October through January coaches were being pulled daily to cover classroom vacancies and sub. PLCs were canceled when the hurricane makeup dates were announced. Collaborative planning only occurred in 3rd and 5th. Collaborative planning was focused on science and math and was limited to one hour a week.

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 2021 2022 school year to the 2022 2023 school year was math achievement. The math achievement on the 2023 FAST assessment PM 3 went down 1.7% The vacancies on our 5th grade team led to this decline. This factor is evidenced by 5th-

grade math proficiency which declined from 35% on the 2022 FSA to 30% proficiency on the FAST PM 3 in 2023.

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.

Our fifth-grade ELA proficiency had the biggest gap when compared to the state proficiency. Our fifth-grade ELA was 38% proficient compared to the state 54% proficiency. The fifth grade team opened with vacancies in 4 of the 6 classrooms and coaches were covering these classes until November. Similarly in math, the gap was -25% between the state and our 5th grade. 5th-grade math was 30% proficient compared to the state proficiency of 55%. South Daytona Elementary opened with 4 teacher vacancies out of 6 units in our 5th-grade classrooms. In fourth grade had 1 teacher vacancy out of 6 units and third grade was fully staffed. Our two coaches were pulled until October and November to fill in for the vacancies. From October through January coaches were being pulled daily to cover classroom vacancies and sub. PLCs were canceled when the hurricane makeup dates were announced. Collaborative planning only occurred in 3rd and 5th. Collaborative planning was focused on science and math and was limited to one hour a week.

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

Based on FAST PM 2 data, South Daytona Elementary 3rd, 4th and 5th graders scored 28% proficiency in ELA and 16% proficiency in math. After receiving PM 2 data, South Daytona created intervention groups based on student data and utilized research-based practices in those groups. The coaches and leaders pulled student groups 3 days a week based on PM 2 data. This strategy yielded positive results based on FAST PM 3 data which showed 40.6% proficiency in ELA and 41% proficiency in math, an increase of 12% in ELA and 25% in math.

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

Two potential areas of concern for South Daytona Elementary are referrals and attendance. In the 2023 school year, SDE had 715 referrals an increase of one referral from the previous year. Our attendance data shows 202 students had attendance below 90% out of our current enrollment of 693.

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

The highest priorities for South Daytona Elementary are improving core instruction, implementing a system for common planning, providing coaching and explicit feedback to teachers and reducing student discipline.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The rationale for selecting positive culture and environment based on the FOCUS system data was specifically student referrals which increased over the previous year from 714 to 715 referrals earned by 293 unique students of our total enrollment of 693 students or 34% of students at South Daytona Elementary.

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Daytona Elementary will reduce the number of students earning a referral by 50% from 34% of our students to 17% of our students by June of 2024 based on the FOCUS system.

Monitoring:

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

By October 2023 during classroom visits, students will be observed utilizing the PBIS calm-down steps when frustrated. By October of 2023, 90% of South Daytona teachers will be observed during classroom visits utilizing the PBIS classroom management steps to redirect off-task or disengaged students. By October of 2023 teachers needing tier 3 coaching support in classroom management will decrease by 95%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Conyers (hmconyer@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 intervention being implemented for building a positive culture and environment is Positive Behavior Intervention and Support PBIS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention of PBIS was chosen based on our school-wide referral data. Through the use of PBIS the teachers at South Daytona will all use common language, common procedures, consistent rewards and consequences to reward positive behavior and diminish the behavior that disrupts instruction. Students at South Daytona will be explicitly taught classroom and common area expectations and those behaviors will be reinforced by school staff. These expectations and reinforcement will reduce the number of students being removed from class and missing instruction.

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.

Train teachers during pre-planning on schoolwide procedures.

Make announcements on the morning news each day reinforcing school-wide expectations and conflict resolution strategies.

Monitoring of referrals each month and determination of cause data to determine how to reduce referrals.

Person Responsible: Jane Jilka (jejilka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Completed by August 11, 2023, (pre-planning training only). Daily and monthly monitoring.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The rationale for this goal was based on data from state achievement in ELA 42%, Math 42% and Science 43%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Daytona Elementary will be 55% proficient in ELA and Math and 65% proficient in Science by May of 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring includes: teacher/Student Look-fors , Verification of Learning, classroom visits, Coaching Cycles, Student's tracking data, and class goals.

Student Practice:

* Student data will be desegregated after PM 1 and PM 2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends this will include students on the EWS list and ESSA subgroups.

Teacher Practice:

* Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
* Administration and coaches will attend collaborative planning to monitor for benchmark-aligned planning of questioning techniques and benchmark-aligned tasks.

Coaching Practices:

* Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.
* Administration will collect coaching plans/notes and provide feedback to instructional coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Jilka (jejilka@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.)

Evidence-based Interventions: Waterford/iReady, SIPP, Being a Reader, Magnetic Reading and Benchmark Advanced Intervention materials, Frax/Reflex, Big Ideas, and Everglades.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs are approved by district as research-based interventions. These materials provide effective intervention to support students in achieving learning gains.

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 or course content specific collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coaches.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Administration and coaches will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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 rationale for this ESSA subgroup's goal was based on data from state achievement in ELA 26%,

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Daytona Elementary will be 45% proficient in ELA by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring includes: teacher/Student Look-fors , Verification of Learning, classroom visits, Coaching Cycles, Student's tracking data, and class goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Jilka (jejilka@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.)

Evidence-based Interventions: Waterford/iReady, SIPPs, Being a Reader, Magnetic Reading and Benchmark Advanced Intervention materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs are approved by district as research-based interventions. These materials provide effective intervention to support students in achieving learning gains.

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 or course content specific collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coaches.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Coaches and administration will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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 rationale for this ESSA subgroup's goal was based on data from state achievement in ELA 15%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Daytona Elementary will be 45% proficient in ELA by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring includes: teacher/Student Look-fors , Verification of Learning, classroom visits, Coaching Cycles, Student's tracking data, and class goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Jilka (jejilka@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.)

Evidence-based Interventions: Waterford/iReady, SIPP, Being a Reader, Magnetic Reading and Benchmark Advanced Intervention materials, Corrective Reading, and Wilson.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs are approved by district as research-based interventions. These materials provide effective intervention to support students in achieving learning gains.

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 or course content specific collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coaches.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Coaches and administration will provide content support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible: Carrie Ann Devaney (cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Our school improvement funding allocations include: Title I, ESSER II, and RAISE. Based on school data, these funds are utilized for: tutoring during and after-school, academic intervention, academic coaches, collaborative planning, Magnetic Reading, and Everglades Math.

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

Kindergarten below grade level: 54% of students based on STAR Early Literacy PM 3.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Early Literacy PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

First Grade below grade level: 65% of students based on STAR Reading on PM 3.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Reading on PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Second Grade below grade level: 89% of students based on STAR Reading on PM 3.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content

expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Reading on PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

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

3rd grade below grade level: 60% of students based on the 2023 FAST PM 3 data end of year.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on 2023 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

4th grade below grade level: 53% of students based on the 2023 FAST PM 3 data end of year.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on 2023 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

5th grade below grade level: 62% of students based on the 2023 FAST PM 3 data end of year.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks.

How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks.

Rationale for critical need: Based on 2023 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

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

Within the 2023-2024 school year, South Daytona will have 50% of students in grades K-2 score at or above grade level as measured by the STAR reading assessment in the third progress monitoring testing window.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Within the 2023-2024 school year, South Daytona will have 54% of students in grades 3-5 score at or above proficiency as measured by the FAST assessment in the third progress monitoring testing window.

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.

South Daytona will monitor the goal via the two prior testing windows, one at the beginning of the year as a baseline and the other as a diagnostic measurement of progress. District assessments and formative assessments in the classroom will serve as intermittent data points to create micro data on standards based rubrics and checklists. Instructional leaders on campus will participate in StockTake twice during the school year to dig into the data and the practices therein.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jilka, Jane, jejilka@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence-based Intervention Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by school-based experts (coaches) and curriculum leaders and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff.

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?

Research has shown that teacher effectiveness is the most important school-based factor that influences student outcomes, including student achievement.

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidenced by Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Professional development Validation Study Meyers, Coby V.; Molefe, Ayrin; Brandt, W. Christopher; Zhu, Bo; Dhillon, Sonica (2016). Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, v38 n3 p455-476. Retrieved from : <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1108395>

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
Literacy Leadership: Create a master schedule that allows for grade level or course content specific collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coaches.	
Literacy Coaching: Coaches and administration will provide ELA pedagogy support based on walkthrough data.	
Assessment: Each ELA assessment the data will be reviewed with the grade level to determine areas of strength, areas of weakness and high-yield instructional practices as well as students who may need additional scaffolding and support to achieve success on grade level assessments in ELA.	Devaney, Carrie Ann, cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: Teachers will receive professional learning in research-based instructional practices through PLC, Early Release Professional Development and faculty meetings.	
Literacy Leadership- Teachers will be provided a personal hard copy of the FL BEST standards in ELA to utilize in collaborative planning. In addition teachers will be given a copy of the DOK scaffolding in color to utilize when planning for scaffolding of students who have deficits in prior grade level benchmarks.	
Literacy Coaching-Teachers will have an administrator or coach at collaborative planning with them to discuss the alignment of the student and teacher actions of the lesson to the rigor of the standard.	
Assessment-Teachers, coaches and admin will plan for formative assessments after daily instruction including the Verification of Learning that occurs after each ELA lesson. This VOL will be planned with scaffolding that enables the teacher to determine what each student needs to be able to move to proficiency on that standard.	Devaney, Carrie Ann, cdevaney@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning-Admin, coaches and district personnel will provide training to teachers on research based instructional practices to utilize in ELA instruction throughout the year using PLC's, faculty meetings, and Early Release Professional development days.	

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.

SDE will share the SIP at our first SAC meeting, PTA meeting, and faculty meetings. Information will be posted on our school website. Additionally, we will share a link to the website on our social media

platforms. Finally, a binder with our SIP and PFEP will be available to all visitors to campus at the front desk where they check-in.

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))

Relationship building includes: PTA meetings, SAC meetings, Meet the Teacher, Open House, Title I after-school and evening events, social media platforms, and the PFEP. The PFEP is located on the school website under the tab for School Information and Reports. The PFEP is also located in a binder in our front office.

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)

South Daytona Elementary will be 55% proficient in ELA and Math and 65% proficient in Science by May of 2024. Plans include: staff training, collaborative planning, PLC, coaching cycles, teacher/student look-fors, verification of learning, student tracking data, class goals, WIN(What I Need)time, ESE services, academic intervention, SF push-in, before/after school tutoring data binders, and Volusia Mentors.

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))

This plan includes the following: PBIS, School Way Cafe, afterschool tutoring, House Next Door and other local counseling services, state/district pre-kindergarten, SEL resources, and after school clubs(STEAM, Girls on the Run, and media book club).

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))

South Daytona Elementary provides the following supports: district mental health therapist(multiple mental health referrals), 2 full-time school counselors(daily support groups), TOA for behavioral support(daily), district behavior specialist(weekly), House Next Door and other local counseling services, community mentor program, Girls on the Run, and PBIS(Positive Behavior Intervention System).

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))

All students will leave South Daytona Elementary with pathways to their high school diploma and all post-secondary options: work, military, 2-year college, 4-year college, or trade.

The preparation for this vision includes: AVID (5th grade), STEAM, gather stakeholder input, research-based strategies, establish family and community connections, and create a school-culture of learning.

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).

Implementation includes: tiered levels of academic and behavioral support through MTSS, state and district data and progress monitoring, ESE/SF/SWD academic and behavioral services, increase learning gains and decrease behavioral referrals, school-wide behavior flowchart, daily behavioral support(TOA and 2 counselors), school-wide PBIS, district behavioral specialist support, para professionals assist with academic growth and positive reinforcement, and academic intervention.

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))

Professional learning and activities include: Performance Matters platform, VCS Data Dashboard, FOCUS, Big Ideas, B1G-M, Benchmark series, Canvas, Savaas Science, Penda Learning, Waterford/iReady, Frax/Reflex, monthly mentoring meeting with new teachers, PLCs to discuss all data to drive instruction, weekly collaborative planning opportunities for Science, ELA, and Math, and all district professional learning opportunities.

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))

The strategies South Daytona Elementary employs are: reinforce positivity, develop communication skills, personal responsibility and independent thinkers, develop family connections and utilize meaningful literacy and math activities(Parents-to-kids program). This year, SDE has a 4 year old blended pre-kindergarten, an intensive ESE pre-kindergarten, and a blended 3 year old pre-kindergarten. These classrooms are being supported by both paras and district personnel.