Friendship Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Friendship Elementary School

2746 FULFORD ST, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/friendship/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.

Friendship Elementary will empower ALL students to succeed by providing high quality, equitable, and positive educational experiences that build academic success and a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through inclusive collaborative practices, Friendship Elementary will create a safe, positive, supportive learning environment where each student is valued and empowered to reach their fullest potential.

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
Rednour, William	Principal	Instructional Coach/Leader Lesson Plans Budget/School Finance PTO/SAC Member Leadership team Coordinator SIP Coordinator Student Clubs and Organizations Contact DA Reporting Duty Rosters School Call-outs Leave approvals Re-Entry Meeting Team Member Curriculum Writing Teams Media Contact/News Releases Grade Changes Verification Accreditation Contact Announcements Business Partners Co-Coordinator Cafeteria Supervision Campus Supervision/Gates Class Rosters Classroom Walk-through Classroom Management Plans (VSET Teachers) Data Administrator Variances (Approval/Denial) Employee Incentives Title 1 Budget/Compliance Threat Assessment Team Member Student Awards/Recognition Assemblies Special Events/Volunteers School Community Relations School Calendar and Events Contact Facilities Roster Verification New Teacher/Guiding Coalition/Admin Meetings ESOL Administrator
Reheiser, Julie	Assistant Principal	AFSCME/VESA/VSET Evaluator Instructional Coach/Leader Lesson Plans Field Trips SAC Consult Attendance Intiative SIP PBIS House System Coordinator Textbooks Emergency Lesson Plans Health Coordinator

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Incentives-Student Morale Staff Attendance Initiative Classroom Walk throughs Safety VPK/Pre-K Programs Master Calendar Yearbook/Pictures Contact Campus Supervision Cafeteria Supervision Facebook Updates ESE Administrator Compliance/FTE Contact Parent Teacher Organization Contact Assessment/Co-Testing Coordinator (Communication with District Leads/Faculty) Security Manual, Security Audits and Security Drills (Coordinator) Threat Assessment Team Lead Wellness Plan Coordinator Problem Solving Team Member
Nix, Lisa	Reading Coach	Coaching Cycle Collaborative Common Planning Data Analysis Professional Development i-Ready School Tracking Learning Walks Lower Quartile Monitoring Literacy Week Contact Superintendent's reading challenge Tier 2 & 3 ELA Support K-5 MTSS Academics for ELA School Leadership Team SIP Problem solving team Member Scholastic Reading Books Literacy Night Lead
Saccone, Julienne	Math Coach	Coaching Cycle Collaborative Common Planning Math/Science Data Analysis Professional Development i-Ready School Tracking Learning Walks Lower Quartile Monitoring Tier 3 Math Support K-5 Family Science Night Lead MTSS Academics for Math School Leadership Team SIP Problem solving team Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Family Math Night Lead Science Boot Camp Lead
Dean, Diana	School Counselor	MTSS for Behavior MTSS for Attendance Model Intervention Programs Problem Solving Team Chair Events Committee Chair Red Ribbon Week Coordinator Suicide Prevention Training Child Abuse Training ELL Coordinator 504 Coordinator School Leadership Team Homeless Liaison DCF Contact External Counseling Referral SIP Threat Assessment Team Member

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.

A guiding coalition team will be established to meet once a month with school leadership team, teachers, and school staff. This initial meeting is set on August 10th to go over the SIP goals and include any feedback/input from the group. This will also be reviewed with the community at our first SAC meeting that takes place on September 26th.

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))

Each monthly Guiding Coalition meeting and SAC meeting will have an agenda item to update both groups on the progress of our SIP goals. Opportunities for feedback from the groups will be solicited to bring to leadership team at possible implementation. FES will have weekly school leadership team (SLT) meetings to update progress of goals and implementation of any practices to work toward achievement of goals.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
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) 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	13	20	9	21	18	20	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	5	4	10	0	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	5	4	6	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	22	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	25	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	25	8	17	0	0	0	56

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	13	7	25	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	49	2	5	4	6	3	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	20	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	31	29	0	0	0	62
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	

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	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
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	49	2	5	4	6	3	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	20	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	31	29	0	0	0	62
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	

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	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
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*	38	52	53	41	53	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				55			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			33		
Math Achievement*	38	55	59	38	42	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				57			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			7		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	48	62	54	49	55	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	60	59	48			39		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	224
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	13	Yes	4	2
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	4	1
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	38			38			48					55
SWD	5			3							4	38
ELL	21			21							3	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			21							2	
HSP	37			35			43				5	52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42			54			69				4	
FRL	34			32			49				5	58

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	41	55	42	38	57	38	49					48
SWD	13	35	40	10	43	38	13					21
ELL	36	48	30	44	56		50					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	41		17	39		33					
HSP	39	56	55	40	58	31	54					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58	66		55	73		60					
FRL	39	52	43	35	54	39	49					52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	39	44	33	32	27	7	48					39
SWD	13	17	20	13	16	9	11					31
ELL	41	46		32	31		43					39

| 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	60		29	30		50					
HSP	38	44		29	33		54					45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	35		40	24		40					
FRL	41	42	29	32	26	7	45					37

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	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	50%	-9%

| MATH | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	57%	-13%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	61%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	55%	-16%

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	51%	-1%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

According to FAST PM 3 data, our 5th grade ELA and Math data had the lowest performance across the 3 scored areas with proficiency in ELA at 37% and Math at 39%. Our classroom walkthrough data showed trends with misalignment of instruction and task in math. This data also showed misalignment of instruction in small group setting in ELA.

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

According to PM 3 data, our 5th grade data in ELA had the greatest decline from the prior year. Performance decreased from 49% to 37%. This cohort group also decreased 2% comparing to the cohort group percentage the prior testing year. The 5th grade group, overall when looking at discipline data, showed the biggest challenge with behavior when looking at the group year over year. Classroom walkthrough data showed that the intervention structure for ELA was not structured and teachers were just filling the time with read aloud and school news.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

According to PM3 data, our 4th grade Math had an 18% deficit when compared to the state. This was a result of a third grade team the prior year that contributed to learning deficits with the cohort group. This group had a 10% increase overall from the previous year but still had the biggest gap when comparing to the state average.

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

Third grade overall had the most improvement overall with PM3 data. This was a result of a restructuring the 3rd grade team from the prior year with a team of teachers that were cohesive and data driven. This group of teachers brought data to collaborative planning to drive the lesson planning.

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

K-5 shows an attendance issue as 77% of our identified EWS students had this as a concern. Sixty-nine percent of our identified EWS students had substantial Reading Deficiencies. As both of these are areas of concern, it demonstrates a need to strengthen our MTSS system and problem-solving to ensure root causes are identified and targeted.

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

Systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are:
MTSS/Problem-Solving
Planning
Coaching
A trend that has been identified is the need to provide ongoing monitoring of these systems to ensure there is evidence of implementation and impact.

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 Intervention

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 focusing on intervention is involving more detailed tracking of progress and frequent adjustments to reach a student's optimal academic proficiency. These tiers become increasingly intense while attempting to address the child's core academic needs.

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

Reading fluency, QPA, VPASS, I-Ready

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

The SLT team will discuss during their weekly meeting to analyze trends and look at data to show students are making gains in math and ELA. Academic coaches will be assigned as the MTSS Chair for their respective contents to continually look at the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Rednour (warednou@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.)

SIPPS will be used in K-2 to provide systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, and sight words. Title 1 funds will be used to purchase i-Ready Magnetic Materials for Intervention Resource Material in Grades 4 and 5.

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

These programs will be used to remediate targeted benchmark/focus skills for groups of tier 2 and tier 3 students to help close achievement gaps in ELA.

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.

PST will meet every other week to analyze student data to determine success of interventions in place for students in ELA tiered groups.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will start in August and will continue through December to get students tiered correctly. In January, the focus will shift to the curriculum meeting the needs of students.

Utilization of strongest teachers meeting the needs of our students with the highest need. Tier 3 students will be instructed by Academic coaches and a Reading/Math Intervention teacher.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will start the 4th week of school that way students can be analyzed for correct placement and continue through the entire school year.

Coaches will monitor student progress and tracking to determine impact of intervention. Students will be moved accordingly if intervention is providing success or more intent instruction is needed.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will start after the first progress monitoring data gives us an ideal of which students need more individualized instruction.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Small group instruction is a method to reinforce or reteach or reteach specific skills and concepts through a reduced student-ratio.

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

Data driven weekly PLC's with administration/
coaches
Monthly collaboration for planning and data reviews
with administration/coaches
An analysis of small group lesson plans by
administration/coaches with a focus on
differentiation.
Admin will conduct data chats with teachers on a quarterly basis.

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

Differentiation: to ensure students educational
equity through instruction that matches the
students' readiness level and ability.
Students will receive explicit instruction in small
group differentiated by their individual needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Differentiation: to ensure students educational
equity through instruction that matches the
students' readiness level and ability.
Students will receive explicit instruction in small
group differentiated by their individual needs.

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

This strategy will ensure educational equity through
instruction that matches the students' readiness
level and ability.
Students will receive explicit instruction in small
group differentiated by their individual needs

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

<table>
<tr><td>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.</td></tr>
</table>

Ensure teachers are following the master schedule instructional blocks including core, small group, intervention and accelerated instruction.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monitoring will start in September and will continue throughout the school year.

Collaborative planning to utilize district aligned resources effectively within the Benchmark Reading curriculum with a focus on small group differentiation.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Coaches will work with teachers to provide direction with small group instruction.

Data chats with teachers/students will happen quarterly. Data chats with teachers/admin will happen quarterly

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur once a quarter after progress monitoring data has been analyzed by the SLT.

#3. 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.

Friendship Elementary had 31% of its teachers leave the school last year. Only one of these teachers was from retirement. The school year started with two teacher spots still open and needing to be filled.

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

The focus will be to retain a higher percentage of teachers after the 23-24 school year. It is normal for some teachers to want change and look for other employment but the goal is to reduce the amount of teachers needing to be hired in half to 15%.

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

This will be monitored by how many teacher positions will need to be filled at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Rednour (warednou@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.)

When discussing with teachers, communication and teacher voice were two of the most identified problems from last year. The focus will be given to teacher to have voice through a guiding coalition. Teachers will also be provided meaningful feedback on instruction during walkthroughs. Restorative circles will be utilized at each faculty meeting to learn about teachers. Teachers will also be recognized at each faculty meeting for strong performance in different realms of school data.

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

Based on teacher feedback, communication and teacher voice were two problems that led to teachers leaving last year.

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.

Establish a guiding coalition and meet once a month to hear teachers thoughts on how to move forward with systems and structures of the school.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will start during preplanning and continue throughout the school year.

Learn about teachers

Person Responsible: William Rednour (warednou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Restorative circle will be utilized at each faculty meeting to learn about each other and create a culture where everyone knows about each other.

Teachers communicated that communication didn't happen last year. This included feedback on instruction and what was taking place within the school. Feedback will be provided from each walkthrough and email. A week at a glance will be utilized to communicate things going on in the school each week.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (waredrou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will start the first week of school and continue through the end of the school year.

Recognize teachers at each faculty meeting. This will involve utilizing creative ways to show teachers they are having an impact on the school's data. A different criteria will be selected to highlight to include strongest gains in a content on any progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: William Rednour (waredrou@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place at each faculty meeting to include ones during preplanning.

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

School improvement funding allocations will be reviewed by the school leadership team and SAC.

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

Our current level of proficient students in 1st grade entering 2nd grade is 31% as evidenced on the Spring ELA assessment.
We expect our performance level to be 54% by May 2023.
The problem/gap is occurring because differentiation needs to remain data driven, focused on student reading needs utilizing evidence based interventions and implemented with fidelity. If differentiation is

data driven, focused on student reading needs utilizing evidence based interventions and implemented with fidelity, the need would be improved by 23%

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

Our current level of proficient students in 3rd and 4th grade entering their new respective grade levels of 4th and 5th is 41% in both grade levels as evidenced on the 2022 FSA ELA. We expect our performance level to be 46% by May 2023. The problem/gap is occurring
because differentiation needs to remain data driven, focused on student reading needs utilizing evidence based interventions and implemented with fidelity. If differentiation is data driven, focused on student reading needs utilizing evidence based interventions and implemented with fidelity, the need would be improved by 5% or more.

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

The percent of all proficient students on State assessments in 2nd grade will increase from 31% to 54% as measured by State assessments

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of all proficient students on ELA FSA in 4th grade will increase from 41% to 46% as measured by State assessments
The percent of all proficient students on ELA FSA in 5th grade will increase from 41% to 46% as measured by State assessments
The percent of all students ELA learning gains on ELA FSA in 4th grade will increase from 55% to 60% as measured by State assessments and using the learning gains data from 21-22 as there was no scored area in this component last year.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-5 B.E.S.T. ELA Standards
- provide after school tutoring with title 1 funds in 3 different ELA groups (K-2, 3-4, and 5th)
- Schedule PLC sessions throughout the year
Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading & evidence-based practices.
Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.
- conduct quarterly universal assessments on the foundations of reading with every student KG - 5

- build intervention plans for each student with intervention teachers
- progress monitor students based on tier level weekly or bi-weekly

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

Nix, Lisa, lrnix@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?

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring
equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles
of coaching, feedback, etc.
Monitor whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and
writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles

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?

Teachers will get to pick the program that they are familiar with through dialogue and discussion during our PLC time with academic coach and adminstration.

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
Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-5 B.E.S.T. ELA Standards Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading & evidence-based practices. Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.	Nix, Lisa, lrnix@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.

Friendship Elementary will disseminate the school-wide plan through Title I Annual Meeting, Parent and Family
Engagement meetings, and other informational sessions, available on our website: https://friendship.vcsedu.org/

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))

Friendship establishes open and regular communication channels with parents, families and community stakeholders. This includes maintaining an updated school website, sending out social media posts, and utilizing communication platforms like School Messenger. Friendship will schedule regular parent conferences, college and career readiness, academic support at
home, and regular School Advisory Committee meetings providing parents, educators, administrators and community to collaborate on input to school policies, programs, and initiatives

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Teachers will have regular opportunities for collaboration and professional learning communities to share effective teaching practices and discuss strategies for curriculum enrichment. We will actively involve families in the academic program by providing workshops on supporting learning at home, understanding curriculum, and effective communication with teachers. We will use a variety of formative and summative assessments to track student progress. Teachers will regularly analyze assessment data to identify areas of improvement and adjust instructional strategies. Friendship will also include after-school programs, tutoring sessions, and academic clubs
that focus on specific subjects or skills.

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))

Friendship will collaborate with parent engagement programs, we will empower parents to actively participate in their child's education through workshops, resources, and involvement opportunities. We will establish data-sharing agreements to exchange relevant information with programs, such as PBIS, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of students' needs and progress. There will be joint professional development sessions with partner programs to share expertise and strategies for improving student outcomes.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No