Debary Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Debary Elementary School

88 W HIGHBANKS RD, Debary, FL 32713

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/debary/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.

Our school community will provide a solid foundation for academic and social growth, promoting diversity and inclusion while establishing life-long learners and positive contributors to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

By working together as a team of parents, faculty, staff, community members, and students, we will ensure the continued success of our children.

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
Sanford, David	Assistant Principal	Faciltiies, Discipline, safety and security
Gotlib, Stacy	Principal	
McFall-Conte, Michelle	Assistant Principal	SIP Development ESE Discipline Supervision
Nation, Shanda	Instructional Coach	Perofrm coaching cycles with teachers, facilitate weekly professional learning community meetings, walk trhoughs of classroom using look fors
Yonker, Michael	Dean	Discipline MTSS Chair Testing Coordinator
MARCUS, VALERIE	Teacher, K-12	
Howard, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
McCoy, Becky	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.

The School Leadership Team met to look at the needs assessment, and all members participated in determining the school targets for the 23-24 school year. The School Improvement Plan was presented to the faculty as a whole for their input, and for discussion. The School Improvement Plan will also be presented at SAC, and will also be available at the front desk for parents and community members to review and give thier input.

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

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through School Leadership Team meetings, PLCs, and the Stocktake process. The SIP goal will be published and posted in areas where teachers frequent (classrooms, teacher's lounge, PLC room, mail room). DeBary Elementary will target those with the greatest achievement gap by targeting those students for intervention services whether it is through being a SWD or through receiving services from our intervention teacher. Students will also receive tier 2 reading instruction provided by the ELA teacher

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	22	18	28	12	16	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	11	5	2	4	9	0	0	0	31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	24	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	12	21	48	20	0	0	0	105

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	7	2	6	10	17	0	0	0	42

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	22	18	28	12	16	19	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	11	5	2	4	9	8	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	17	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	21	17	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	7	17	26	15	9	0	0	0	79

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	7	2	6	10	17	12	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	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	22	18	28	12	16	19	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	11	5	2	4	9	8	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	17	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	21	17	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	7	17	26	15	9	0	0	0	79

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	7	2	6	10	17	12	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	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*	59	52	53	64	53	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				61			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			47		
Math Achievement*	68	55	59	69	42	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				72			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			55		
Science Achievement*	78	62	54	74	55	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	60	59	46			62		

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	42			
HSP	60			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	69			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	56			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	47			
HSP	70			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	59			68			78					69
SWD	14			34			43				4	
ELL	42			53							3	69
AMI												
ASN	80			80							2	
BLK	33			48			50				4	
HSP	56			55			63				4	
MUL	73			73							3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	60			72			85				4	
FRL	47			58			72				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	64	61	36	69	72	49	74					46
SWD	29	45	35	38	50	27	36					
ELL	44	55		44	64							46
AMI												
ASN	63	70		69	80							
BLK	43	40		43	60	50						
HSP	67	61		64	74		83					
MUL	65	45		71	73							
PAC												
WHT	65	64	43	72	72	45	74					
FRL	52	57	41	59	66	43	64					50

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	66	58	47	63	67	55	70					62
SWD	29	40	40	31	52	53	32					
ELL	47			43								62
AMI												
ASN	73			73								
BLK												
HSP	57	59		57	35		47					60
MUL	57			50								
PAC												
WHT	69	55	48	66	71	65	76					
FRL	55	52	45	52	62	53	62					60

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	60%	53%	7%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	57%	10%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	51%	23%

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 PM 3 data, the component that showed the lowest performance was ELA, which had 59% scoring a level 3 or above.

Contributing factor: In EWS, third grade had 48 students with a substantial reading decificency. One hundred twenty-eight kids in 3rd-5th have a substantial reading deficiency. Third grade acccounts for 37.5% of students with a substantial reading deficiency. Historical data shows that this cohort of 22-23 sy third graders has not demonstrated proficiency compared to the other grade levels at DeBary. Walk through data shows deficits in higher level questioning and verification of learning.

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 ELA data had the largest decrease going from 64% to 59% of students scoring profiency.

Contributing factors: Coaching and intervention processes were not fully implemented. Academic coaches were part coach and part intervention teacher. One of the academmic coaches had to be pulled in January into a 4th grade classroom. An intervention teacher that was hired did not complete the school year. That reading intervention teacher was not replaced. The remaining coach/intervention teacher focused on MTSS. Not a hundred percent of teachers are reading endorsed.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was 3rd grade ELA with DeBary scoring 59% scoring a level 3 or above. The state had 50% of student scoring a level 3 or above. Even though DeBary was still above the state average, this was our lowest area.

Contributing factors: Coaching and intervention processes were not fully implemented. Academic coaches were part coach and part intervention teacher. One of the academmic coaches had to be pulled in January into a 4th grade classroom. An intervention teacher that was hired did not complete the school year. That reading intervention teacher was not replaced. Walk trhoughs also showed the need for more training in high level questioning techniques and verification of learning.

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

When looking at PM data throughout the school year. Math showed the most growth. After PM1 data, 9.3% scored at proficiency. After PM 3, 69% of students scored a 3 or above. This was an increase of 59.5% scoring profiency.

Contributing factors: Walk through data shows that 5/5 classrooms were implementing collaborative structures, 5/5 classrooms were using academic vocabulary, 3/3 third grade classrooms were implementing benchmark aligned tasks.

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

Coaching and intervention processes were not fully implemented. Acadmeic coaches were part coach and part intervention teacher. One of the academmic coaches had to be pulled in January into a 4th grade classroom. An intervention teacher that was hired did not complete the school year. That reading intervention teacher was not replaced. The remaining coach/intervention teacher focused on MTSS When looking at EWS, there is a need to strengthen DeBary's MTSS process and solving of problems with fidelity to ensure the causes are identified and targeted for intervention.

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

1. Achievement of students with disabilities
2. clarity of practices (collabortive planning and PLCs, walk throughs, coaching and intervention processes, MTSS)
3. implementation of higher level questioning strategies and verification of learning (using look fors)

A trend that has been targteted is the need for ongoing progress monitoring of these systems to ensure there is evidence of implementation and impact with fidelity.

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 ELA

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.

At DeBary Elementary, since the 2018-2019 school year, our ELA achievement has decreased from 66% to 59% acheiving proficiency. For the 21-22 school year, 37% of student's with disabilities (ESSA subgroup) scored proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment. Currently 14.8% of students with disabilities (ESSA subgroup) scored proficiency on FAST progress monitoring 3 assessment in ELA. There is a need to restructure responibilities of non rostered teachers (TOA, coaches, intervention). DeBary Elementary has a need to develop clarity of practices with fidelity through the implementation of look fors, collaborative planning , PLCs, walk throughs, MTSS.

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

Student Practice:
*After administration of FAST Progessing Monitoring 1 and Progress Monitoring 2, all students will show growth consistent with district and state growth trends.
*By February 2024, 65% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned common assessments (VBAs, chapter assessments, etc.)
Teacher Practice:
*By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with Benchmark aligned tasks as evidenced through walkthroughs with targeted walk throughs.
Coaching Practice:
*By May 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%.

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

Student Practice:
*Student data will be disaggregated after FAST progress monitoring 1 and 2 and compared with state and district growth trends.
*65% of students scoring proficiency in ELA will be the goal for the 23-24 school year. After each benchmark aligned assessment, teachers, coaches, and administrators will track and chart the data in order to measure progress over the school year.
Teacher Practice:
*Classroom walkthrough data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
*Administration and coaches will attend PLCs to monitor for benchmark aligned planning of tasks.
Coaching Practice:
*School Leadership team will review results of collaboartive planning sessions
*School coaches will provide administrators with look fors every Friday.
*Administrative team will develop a walk through schedule to walk through classrooms, targeting the four look fors, and compile quantitiatve data
*Leadership team will participate in the Stocktake process
*ESE Administrator will develop systems to onitor SWD data
*ESE administrator will, every two weeks, monitor SWD IEP data through data tracking sheets, support facilitation logs, and lesson gain charts, , and every 9 weeks monitor completion of progress reports. Feedback will be given to the teachers on the data and paperwork.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@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.)

Providing professional development: Administrative team and coaches will provide training in Student's with Disabilities, MTSS, verification of learning, improving higher level questioning, These professional developments will deepen alignment to benchmarks, and build capacity among faculty.

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

Educational research has shown that building teacher capacity is an important factor that influences student outcomes, and student achievement.

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.

Administrative team will create, and calibreate a walk through calendar that targets the four look fors. Feedback will be shared with teachers. Walk through data will be shared at Faculty meetings, Grade Chair meetings, and School Leadership Team meetings.

Person Responsible: Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 30th, 2023

Regular data monitoring of Students with Disabilities to determine if progress on grade level and IEP goals is taking place.This will take place through a data spreadsheet of SWD, along with monitoring of support facilitation logs, and monitoring of IEP goal data collection.

Person Responsible: Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: After district assessments in Performance Matters,

Faculty meetings, and PLCs will be used for collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Shanda Nation (smnation@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: weekly PLCs

#2. 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.

At DeBary Elementary, for the 22-23 school year, we had 360 discipline referrals. This was an increase of 11 referrals. During the 21-22 school year, DeBary Elementary had 52 incidents of hitting and striking . For the 22-23 school year, DeBary increased to 134 incidents of hitting and striking. This was an increase of 38%. For the 21-22 school year, there were 33 incidents of school rule violation. For the 22-23 school year, this increased to 73. This was an increase of 45%. When looking at students with disabilities, this subgroup accounted for 129 of the 360 discipline referrals. This accounts for 35% of the discipline referrals. When looking by students, 124 students received discipline referrals, 28 of those students were students with disabilities, which accounted for 22% of the students.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, DeBary Elementary will decrease amounts of hitting and striking and school rules violation by 30% (94 for hitting and striking and 51 for school rules violation). Referrals for students with disabilities, at DeBary Elementary will decrease by 25%(97 referrals and 21 students) for the 23-24 school year.

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

Discipline data will be monitored through the PBIS team. Office discipline referrals and consequences will be monitored once a month and shared at faculty meetings, and PBIS team meetings. Discpline data for students with disabilities will be monitored twice a month, and shared at faculty meetings and PBIS team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Sanford (dwsanfor@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 strategy that Debary will be using will be a multi disciplinary approach through the framwork of MTSS (Multi tiered system fo supports), and PBIS (Positive behavior intervention supports). Results will be shared and monitored through the PBIS team and faculty meetings.

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

Research has shown that the implementation of PBIS (positive behavior intervention supports) will decrease the amount of discipline due to the implementation of the positive supports.

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.

Monthly PBIS leadership team meetings will take place to monitor student discipline, and implementation of PBIS expectations.

Person Responsible: David Sanford (dwsanfor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly through May 2024

Discpline of Students with Disabilities will be monitored monthly and shared with PBIS team.

Person Responsible: Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly through May 2024

PBIS presentation during preplanning week. Expectations will be reviewed, along with changes to Debary's PBIS plan.

Person Responsible: VALERIE MARCUS (vmmarcus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

ERPL in January of 2024 will be a refresh of PBIS for the mid year.

Person Responsible: David Sanford (dwsanfor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

Walk throughs will be conducted to provide feedback on classroom implementations of PBIS expectations.

Person Responsible: David Sanford (dwsanfor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout school year, ending in May 2024.

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

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