

Volusia County Schools

Spirit 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Spirit Elementary School

1500 MEADOWLARK DR, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Spirit Elementary is committed to ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to become a responsible, productive citizen able to cope and compete in changing social and economic conditions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spirit believes we are the difference between what is and what could be for students.

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
Figueroa, Laura	Principal	
Goldsmith, William	Assistant Principal	
TUFARIELLO, DARLENE	Instructional Coach	
Randall, Patricia	Math Coach	
Hernandez, Sarah		

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 Improvement Plan is shared at SAC and PTO meetings with families and business partners. We have an open discussion about the school goals academically and socially as well as welcome any input. We will present the School Improvement plan to faculty during a faculty meeting. We used teacher input from our school-based training to determine the school's Positive Behavioral Interventional Support Program.

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 leadership team will meet every Monday at 9 AM to review the data from the previous week. This data will include walkthrough information, student district assessment data and state progress monitoring data.

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	16	29	23	32	26	30	0	0	0	156	
One or more suspensions	0	14	17	24	27	21	0	0	0	103	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	17	6	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	37	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	31	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	15	30	62	45	36	0	0	0	211	

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	4	3	8	19	28	0	0	0	62

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	7	19	38	35	22	26	0	0	0	147	
One or more suspensions	0	6	9	4	5	7	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	39	14	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	18	7	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	30	0	0	0	68	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	34	31	0	0	0	65	
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	1	3	1	40	25	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	7	19	38	35	22	26	0	0	0	147	
One or more suspensions	0	6	9	4	5	7	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	39	14	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	18	7	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	30	0	0	0	68	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	34	31	0	0	0	65	
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	1	3	1	40	25	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
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*	47	52	53	49	53	56	48		
ELA Learning Gains				55			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			46		
Math Achievement*	42	55	59	49	42	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				50			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30			19		
Science Achievement*	64	62	54	64	55	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	60	59	62			53		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	259
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	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
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	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	46			
MUL	20	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	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%
SWD	34	Yes	2	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	49			

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				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			42			64					60
SWD	22			19			31				5	54
ELL	35			37			55				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			41			60				3	
HSP	38			36			50				5	62
MUL	20			20							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			55			84				4	
FRL	42			37			55				5	57

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	49	55	45	49	50	30	64					62
SWD	20	44	46	21	33	26	23					61
ELL	39	52	38	37	46	33	47					62
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	34	33		55	48							
HSP	43	55	40	41	50	40	58					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	58	64	58	52	25	70					60
FRL	45	54	43	46	52	31	64					63

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	48	50	46	43	34	19	46					53
SWD	23	34	50	23	22	13	23					50
ELL	37	38	31	32	26	23	32					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	38		41	23		21					
HSP	42	50	29	34	32	21	36					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	53		55	37		66					
FRL	46	45	41	39	34	22	44					52

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	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	53%	-9%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	57%	-18%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	59%	-15%	61%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	51%	12%

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.

Overall math proficiency was the lowest component among all tested area. The proficiency among 3rd thru 5th grade students was 47% and that was an overall 2% drop from the prior year. The contributing factors include the loss of a dedicated math intervention time in the master schedule. Also, there was a loss of a unit in 3rd grade causing the homerooms to have higher class sizes and less time for consistent small group instruction. There was only one intervention teacher dedicated to math intervention and she only worked with 5th grade math which explains the drop of 11% by 3rd grade and 9% by 4th grade in math proficiency.

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

4th grade math had the largest decline in math proficiency. There was an 11% drop from 55% to 44%. There was a new teacher that taught math and she did not have the knowledge of the math benchmarks. There was also a new math curriculum that the teachers did not know how to properly provide instruction. Class sizes were 32 students per class, and this caused a difficulty with consistency in small groups and intervention. There was no intervention teacher to provide math intervention for students so the classroom teacher would try to fit it in during the math block of time.

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

The greatest gap when compared to the state is the overall math data. Spirit Elementary had a math proficiency of 47% and the state demonstrated a proficiency of 58%. There was a new math curriculum, and the teachers did not have the strength in standards-based math instruction. There was a 3rd grade teacher that left and a missing 4th grade teaching unit. This caused the students class size ratio to be very high in those homerooms. There was also a lack of intervention in 3rd and 4th grade math, and this is demonstrated in the large decline in overall proficiency in those grade levels.

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

According to FAST, 5th grade Math demonstrated the largest increase in proficiency growth. There was a dedicated interventionists that worked with the 5th grade math teachers. The students were departmentalized, and they all received consistent math instruction from one teacher.

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

Attendance below 90% and one or more suspensions.

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

1. Planning
2. Coaching
3. Intervention/MTSS

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 Collaborative Planning**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.

As a team it was determined that teachers need to improve their capacity in benchmark aligned instruction and therefore collaborative planning with an academic coach and / or administrator can ensure that teachers have lesson plans that are benchmark aligned and task aligned. This will assist in overall improvement in Tier 1 instruction and assist with students closing achievement gaps and demonstrating proficiency.

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 PM 1 and PM 2, all students will show growth consistent with state growth trends. By February 2024, 50% of K-2 students will show proficiency on the ELA and Math PM 2 STAR assessments.

45% of 3-5 students will show proficiency on the ELA and Math PM 2 FAST assessments.

57% of 5th graders will show proficiency on the Science VBA 2.

By May 2024, 70% of K-2 students will show proficiency on ELA and Math PM 3 STAR assessments.

55% of 3-5 students will show proficiency on the ELA PM 3 FAST assessments and 53% will show proficiency on the Math PM 3 FAST assessment. 66% of 5th graders will show proficiency on the statewide Science assessment.

Teacher Practice:

By May 2024, 80% of classroom teachers will provide students with Benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice:

By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support will decrease by 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Student Practice:

Student data will be disaggregated after PM 1 and PM 2 and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.

In K-2, 70% proficiency will be the common goal across all content areas for the 23-24 school year.

In 3-5, 55% proficiency will be the common goal for ELA and 53% proficiency will be the common goal for Math. After each district assessment is administered, teachers with the support of coaches will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practice:

Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.

Administration and coaches will attend collaborative planning to facilitate and monitor the planning and preparing for benchmark-aligned tasks are occurring.

Coaching Practice:

Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Figueroa (lfigueroa@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.)

By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by coaches and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks and build capacity among staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that teacher efficacy has a large effect size on student success. Teacher effectiveness is the most important school-based factor that influences student outcomes, including 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.

Create a master schedule that allows grade level or course content specific collaborative planning to occur weekly with support by administrators and instructional coaches. Leadership team will create a common planning protocol that defines expectations for before, during, and after planning.

Person Responsible: DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: We will have a master collaborative planning schedule and planning protocol for before, during, and after planning by September 1st

Coaches will provide content support based on walkthrough data. A schedule will be created indicating focus, frequency and methods of support.

Person Responsible: Patricia Randall (prandall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: The schedule will be created by September 1st.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

ESSA subgroup data indicated that students with disabilities in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA and Math achievement as measured on the state assessment. Spirit's students with disabilities performed at a 30% overall in ELA and Math.

ESSA Subgroup data indicated that African American students in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA and Math achievement as measured on the state assessment. Overall, Spirit's African American students performed at 36%.

ESSA Subgroup data indicated that our Multi-Racial students in grades 3-5 performed below the required threshold of 41% in ELA and Math achievement as measured on the state assessment. Overall, Spirit's Multi-Racial students performed at 36%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By February 2024, 40% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA and Math state FAST assessment. 45% of African American and Multi-Racial students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA and Math state FAST assessment.

By May of 2024, 50% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA and Math state FAST assessment. 55% of African American and Multi-Racial students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA and Math state FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will utilize the results of the FAST progress monitoring assessments and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the year for African American and Multi-Racial students as well as students with disabilities. We will review district and progress monitoring assessments through PLCs to determine progress towards our overall goal as well as determine intervention or enrichment needs.

Throughout weekly PLC data discussions teachers will identify students in these ESSA subgroups that are not making adequate progress towards their goals and take action through the MTSS process. We will see evidence of implementation and impact of coaching as teachers require less scaffolding to interpret data and make data- driven decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@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.)

Students with disabilities and identified African American and Multi-Racial students will receive extended learning time implementing tier 3 researched-based intensive instruction utilizing Wilson phonics programs, Teacher Toolbox lessons and Benchmark Advanced intervention lessons to reduce deficits and increase proficiency on grade-level standards in ELA.

These students will also receive tier 3 research-based intensive instruction in Math using BIG Ideas math intervention and increased usage on reflex and frax.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data from the Power Bi dashboard illuminated that our students with disabilities, African American and Multi-Racial students in both subject areas performed below the threshold of 41%.

We selected the strategy of extending the learning time for students with disabilities and identified African American and Multi-Racial students using evidence-based curriculum to address increasing the number of students continue the progress towards proficiency.

The IReady teacher toolbox for reading and math utilizes a problem solving-based approach that strengthens students' cognitive structures, and builds conceptual understanding through reasoning, practice, and productive discussion using real-world scenarios.

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.

For Students with Disabilities

Homogeneous grouping of 4th and 5th grade based on ELA in 4th grade and ELA and Math in 5th grade. Scheduling walkthroughs to ensure that tier 1 instruction in addition to specialized design instruction, corrective reading etc. is occurring.

4th and 5th grade support facilitator and intervention services will be in the classroom with general education teacher.

Evaluate the services and needs of students with disabilities not making progress toward grade-level proficiency every 4 weeks and determine next steps to remove barriers.

Person Responsible: Sarah Hernandez (sehernan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing from the beginning of school year. Make modifications as needed based on data every 4 weeks.

For our African American and Multi-Racial students we will review district assessments and state assessment data through weekly PLCs to determine progress towards our overall goal as well as look for necessary modifications of intervention or enrichment plans to increase proficiency of grade-level standards in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Sarah Hernandez (sehernan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing from the beginning of school year. Make modifications as needed based on data.

#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.

Spirit Elementary's need is based on the high turn over of teachers at our school over the last two years. Currently we have 5 brand new teachers to Volusia county and an additional 6 new teachers to our school. The new administration wants to make sure our teachers have the sufficient help and guidance necessary to continue to work at Spirit.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, teacher retention will increase by 90%. This will be based on the percentage of all teachers that remain employed at our school. There will be an increase of teacher interns that will be recruited as teachers because of the amount of support and professional learning we will provide for them.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly to determine support needed. Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze the coaching support plan and data trends collected to make adjustments as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@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.)

Positive educator engagement leads to high-quality education, innovative idea sharing, and instruction tailored to student needs. Providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another. New teachers will have opportunities to express their opinions and concerns through monthly mentor meetings. Follow through with providing what the teachers need will help them feel supported.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that by providing professional development and opportunities to collaborate with mentor or grade level teammates teacher retention will increase. In addition, teachers who lack intensive clinical experience and coursework have been shown to be two to three times more likely to leave the profession than those who have this type of preparation.

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 schedule for the mentor to meet with the new teachers to discuss any concerns and allow for the teacher to have a voice. In addition the mentor will assist the teachers with completing the teacher induction program assuring that all professional development required gets completed in time.

Person Responsible: DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning of September

Provide feedback and suggestions after classroom walkthroughs weekly.
Monthly meetings with administration to discuss any concerns or feedback.

Person Responsible: Laura Figueroa (lfiguero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning end of August.

Provide a quarterly survey for teachers to have a voice and express if more support is needed.

Person Responsible: Laura Figueroa (lfiguero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Each quarter

Provide voluntary monthly coffee talks or snack chats that focus on tech programs and any topic the teachers choose to refresh their knowledge or learn more about.

Person Responsible: DARLENE TUFARIELLO (dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly beginning in September

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).

Administration and Coaches meet monthly to discuss school improvement funding and what resources will be acquired based on student need.

According to the Math Progress Monitoring 3 FAST data, there was a decline in our math scores. Funding will be used to provide math resources such as manipulatives for the students to take home during curriculum nights.

Based on our ELA Progress Monitoring 3 FAST data, our students with disabilities, African American and Multi-Racial students performed below the threshold. Funds available will be used to purchase additional books that can be sent home along with supplies such as folders, pencils, and paper. Timers will be sent home for students to use to practice fluency.

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

End of year progress monitoring indicates that our overall proficiency in grades K-2 is above 50%, for an average of 58%. The percent of students BELOW proficiency by grade level include Kindergarten is at 39% below proficiency, 1st grade is at 43% below proficiency, and 2nd grade is at 44% below proficiency.

Based on overall proficiency data, an area of focus is to continue to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction of the ELA benchmarks for students to increase proficiency on the progress monitoring assessments. To increase proficiency for Tier 2 and 3 students, targeted instruction will need to be purposeful through collaborative planning. Phonemic Awareness and Phonics instruction must be taught with fidelity.

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

End of year state assessment indicate that our overall proficiency in grades 3-5 is at 50%, an average of 50%. The percent of students BELOW proficiency by grade level include third grade is at 54% below proficiency, second grade is at 53% below proficiency, and 5th grade is at 42% below proficiency.

Based on overall proficiency data, an area of focus is to continue to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction of the ELA benchmarks for students to increase proficiency on the progress monitoring assessments. To increase proficiency for Tier 2 and 3 students, targeted instruction will need to be purposeful through collaborative planning.

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

Increase achievement in ELA from 58% to 68% determined by end of year progress monitoring data.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase achievement in ELA from 50% to 55% determined by the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment.

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.

We will utilize the results of the ELA FAST progress monitoring assessments and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the year for for all students. We will review district assessments data through PLCs to determine progress towards our overall goal as well as determine intervention or enrichment needs.

Throughout weekly PLCs and collaboration with intervention teachers, ESOL, and ESE support facilitators data discussions will identify students that are not making adequate progress towards their goals and take action through the MTSS process.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

TUFARIELLO, DARLENE, dtufarie@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?

Increase teacher capacity in strategic planning for Tier 1 core instruction and interventions as needed. To accomplish this, we will implement the evidence-based strategy of Multi-tiered System of Supports. Teachers will provide explicit and systematic core instruction and multisensory intervention of the ELA B.E.S.T. standards for tier 2 and tier 3 students. This will be monitored through progress monitoring and unit assessments.

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?

MTSS is based on the on-going analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making to shift from reactive to proactive response to intervention. The effect size of a carefully implemented MTSS is 1.29 according to John Hattie.

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
Review prior year students assessment data to set up intervention groups based on those students' needs. (K-2 STAR reading assessments, 3-5 FAST assessments) Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Strategic planning to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the Decision Rules.	TUFARIELLO, DARLENE, dtufarie@volusia.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning through PLCs on MTSS systems and structures. Collaborative planning to include intervention teachers to assist with planning for tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction.	Hernandez, Sarah, sehernan@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.

Advertising for the dissemination for the school improvement plan includes displaying a time and date for families, businesses and school staff to provide input. This will occur during a SAC and Title 1 Meetings. It will also be posted on our school class dojo page where it can be translated in Spanish.

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))

Spirit Elementary uses Class Dojo, X, Facebook and our school website to solicit feedback from stakeholders and share the school vision and mission. In addition we share pictures of school and students' achievements and successes on our platforms. The webpage that will have a link to the Family Engagement Plan is <https://spirit.vcsedu.org/>

Spirit Elementary will hold curriculum events to assist families in understanding student standards, performance expectations and how they can support their learners at home. Teachers post on social media and send home instructional calendars that show parents what their students are learning and when as well as assessment calendars.

PTO and the school will hold free events that will have teachers reading stories, practicing math facts, and doing science experiments.

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)

With the permission of families, students performing below level will have increased learning time during their special area focusing on the areas they have deficiencies in.

Spirit is departmentalized in grades 3-5. By focusing on one or two subject areas, teachers can dig deep into the standards and develop a teaching specialty. Students benefit from a more focused teacher.

In 4th and 5th grade the students are homogeneously grouped. In homogeneous grouping, students get the opportunity to work on materials that are ideal for their specific strengths and areas for development. Enrichment and accelerated curriculum can be achieved and is provided by assigning I-Ready lessons that are above grade level. Teachers can also use the readers theater lessons in benchmark. In math teachers can also assign above grade level work on I-Ready in addition to adding higher depth of knowledge math tasks for students to complete.

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))

N/A